DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 805 FL 014 634

AUTHOR	Lambert, Richard D.; And Others
TITLE	Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Universities, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.; National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 84
CONTRACT	DAMD17-83-C-3093; OP-20159-83
NOTE	450p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC18 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Area Studies; Armed Forces; College Faculty; Computer Oriented Programs; Educational History; *Educational Improvement; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Information Sources; Institutional Cooperation; Language Proficiency; Library Collections; National Defense; National Surveys; Organizations (Groups); Policy Formation; Program Costs; Program Evaluation; *Public Policy; *Research; *Second Language Instruction; Specialization; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The report resulting from a federally mandated year-long study of the status of foreign language and area studies in United States higher education concentrates on the present capacities of the nation's universities for advanced training and research in those fields. A preamble outlines the history of language and area studies in this country, noting the role of military and defense education. A chapter on language competency examines teaching methods, instructional and evaluative issues, and funding in the broad field of foreign language instruction. A chapter on area competency examines defense education efforts and the demand and supply of trained individuals. An overview of related research looks at its findings, characteristics, funding, policy formation, and other issues. A discussion of campus-based and national organizations outlines their functions, support, and competition for funding. A chapter concerning library and information resources discusses resource sharing, administrative and financial issues in maintaining and building library collections and resource centers, and special issues such as computer applications, overseas resources, materials preservation, and resource monitoring. A final chapter summarizes the problems and recommendations for each of these areas and makes general statements concerning funding and monitoring. Supplemental information derived from the national survey is appended, including methodology, language and area programs, statistics on published faculty research by area of the world and field of discipline, Fulbright grants (1971-1984), and summaries of study group needs by world area. (MSE)

ED249805

FL014634

Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Association of
American Universities

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Report by the
Association of American Universities
April 1984

RESEARCH TEAM

Project Director:
Dr. Richard D. Lambert
South Asia Regional Studies
University of Pennsylvania

Research Coordinator:
Dr. Margaret B. Merrill, AAU

Senior Researchers:
Dr. Elinor G. Barber
Institute of International Education

Dr. Eleanor Jorden
Modern Languages and Linguistics
Cornell University

Dr. Leon Twarog
Director, Center for Russian
and East European Studies
Ohio State University

STEERING COMMITTEE

Chairman, Steering Committee
Dr. Irving Shain, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dr. Herbert Ellison, Secretary
Kennan Institute for Advanced
Russian Studies
Smithsonian Institution

Dr. William P. Glade, Director
Institute of Latin American Studies
University of Texas, Austin

Dr. Michael Lofchie, Director
African Studies Center
University of California, Los Angeles

Dr. Gayl Ness
Southeast Asian Studies Center
Director,Program for Population Planning
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Robert L. Payton, President
Exxon Education Foundation

Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, President
Social Science Research Council

Dr. Robert E. Ward, Director
Center for Research on
International Studies
Stanford University

Dr. R. Bayly Winder
Kevorkian Center for Near Eastern
Studies
New York University

Project Manager
Dr. John C. Crowley, AAU

Beyond Growth:
The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies

Richard D. Lambert

with

Elinor G. Barber
Eleanor Jorden
Margaret B. Merrill
Leon I. Twarog

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES
Washington, D.C.
April 1984

The research reported herein was conducted for the Department of Defense under Contract Number DAMD17-83-C-3093 for the U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command of the Department of the Army to fulfill the requirements of the House and Senate Conference Reports to the DOD Authorization Act of 1983, and under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (OP-20159-83). Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Defense.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 84-70983

Association of American Universities
One Dupont Circle, Suite 730
Washington, D.C. 20036

Printed in the United States of America

Table of Contents

Preface...ix

Acknowledgements.......................................xii

1. **Preamble**..1
    The Historical Setting...............................2
    Language and Area Studies in the Military......4
    Postwar Programs and Rapid Growth..............6
    The End of Rapid Growth..........................10
    Language and Area Studies Training in the Defense Community.............................13
    Relations with Campus-Based Programs..........17
    The Nature and Scope of the Project............22

2. **Language Competency**................................29
    Two Systems of Instruction.........................29
    Sustaining Existing National Resources.........32
    Persistent Problems in Campus-Based Language Instruction.............................44
    Area Study Group Differences......................46
    A Common Metric of Language Proficiency.......50
    Raising Levels of Language Competency.........58
        Language Competency in the Existing Pool of Specialists.............................58
        Language Competency Among Program Graduates...62
        Length of Time Required to Learn a Language...71
    Serving Diverse Clienteles.........................76
    Implementing Organization and Funding.........86
    The Lack of Funding.................................89
    Recapitulation--An Action Plan for Language Pedagogy.....................................91

3. **Area Competency**......................................95
    Area Training in the Department of Defense....95
    Areality in Training...............................100
    Special Cost of Training..........................109
        Overseas Training..............................109

    Length of Training....................110
    Fragmentation in Training and Student Support....................111
  Disciplinary Imbalances....................115
  Effective Demand and National Need for Specialists....................128

4. **Research**....................144
  An Overview of the Findings....................146
  Characteristics of Research....................147
  Academic Coverage of the Research Product....149
    What the Sample Represents....................151
    The Enumeration Process....................154
  Policy Relevance and Utilization of the Research Product....................163
  Funding Agency Coverage of Research....................173
  Access to Overseas Research Sites....................182

5. **Campus-Based and National Organizations**....................188
  Campus-Based Centers....................188
    Center Functions....................190
    Maintaining Center Strength....................197
    The Role of Title VI Support....................200
  New Directions in Center Support....................204
  The Number of Centers....................211
  Selection and Monitoring....................218
  National Organizations....................220

6. **Library and Information Resources**....................232
  Resource Sharing Between Government and Universities....................232
  On-Campus Library Resources....................236
    The Size of Area-Related Collections......237
    The Costs of Acquisitions and Staffing....239
  The Center Perspective....................244
    Staffing Needs....................244
    Backlog of Foreign Language Materials.....246
    Special Costs of Acquiring Foreign Language Materials....................247
  The Library Administrator's View....................249
  The National View....................251
    A Strategy for Collaboration and Complementarity of Resources....................251

Adapting Non-Roman Scripts to the Computerized Network....................253
Inventory of Existing Overseas Bibliographic Services and Data Bases..254
Preservation of Materials..................255
Monitoring Our National Library and Information Resources..................256
Summary of Recommendations...................257

7. **Conclusions**.......................................260
Summary of Problems and Recommendations......260
Funding..278
Monitoring.....................................280

Appendices

A. **Glossary**..285

B. **Methodology**.......................................288
Site Visits....................................288
Analysis of Applications for Title VI Support...........................289
Analysis of Training of Applicants for Title VI Dissertation Year Fellowships....292
Other Unpublished Sources of Data............293

C. **ASTP Language and Area Programs**.................303

D. **Languages Taught in Academic and Government Institutions by World Area**...................306

E. **Language Enrollments in 39 Title VI Centers, 1982**..319

F. **Research Profile of Title VI Faculty**............325
Summary of Distribution of Publications on all World Areas........................330
Detailed Tabulations on Africa...............341
Detailed Tabulations on East Asia............353
Detailed Tabulations on Eastern Europe and the USSR........................357
Detailed Tabulations on Inner Asia...........362

Detailed Tabulations on Latin America........363
Detailed Tabulations on The Middle East......371
Detailed Tabulations on South Asia...........378
Detailed Tabulations on Southeast Asia.......382
Detailed Tabulations on Western Europe.......386

G. Grants Awarded Under The Fulbright Program, 1971-84....................................391

H. Summaries of Special Needs of Each World Area Studies Group..............................399
Africa - by Michael F. Lofchie...............400
Eastern Europe and USSR - by Herbert J. Ellison......................403
Japan - by Robert E. Ward....................407
Latin America - by William Glade.............409
The Middle East - by R. B. Winder............412
South Asia - by Richard D. Lambert...........415
Southeast Asia - by Gayl D. Ness.............420
Western Europe - by William B. Bader.........424

I. Members of the Project Team...............430

Bibliography.................................432

Tables

2-1: Number and Percent of Language Classes By Number of Enrollees in a Sample of Title VI Centers, 1982..............................35
2-2: The Defense Language Institute Classification of Languages by Level of Difficulty..........48
2-3: Language Speaking Competencies of Soviet and East European Specialists.....................60
2-4: Number of 1983 Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants by Highest Year Enrolled in Language Course During Graduate Training.....66

3-1: Number of Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants by Discipline and World Area.................103

3-2: Analysis of Graduate Coursework of Title VI Dissertation Year Fellowship Applicants, 1983.....106
3-3: Disciplinary Distribution of Specialists in 1970 and the 1980's: in East European, Latin American and South Asian Studies......116
3-4: Degree of Utilization of Area Expertise (Areality) in Teaching and Research by Soviet and East European Specialists by Discipline.....119
3-5: Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollments by Discipline in 33 Title VI Centers, 1982.....123
3-6: Concentration of Coursework Devoted to Language and Area Courses by Title VI Dissertation Year Fellowship Applicants, 1983.....125
3-7: Ph.D. Completion and Skill Utilization Patterns for a Hypothetical Group of FLAS Fellowship Recipients.....132
3-8: Estimates of National Needs for Specialists from National Targets Project, 1981.....134
3-9: Degrees Awarded by Title VI Centers Over Time.....135
3-10: Number of Title VI Fellowships by Year and World Area.....136
3-11: Market Demand Estimates By Soviet and East European Specialists.....140

4-1: Disciplinary Distribution of All Knowledge Producers, Experts, and Title VI Center Faculty Publications, in South Asian Studies, 1976-81.....153
4-2: Percentage of Publications of Center Faculty by Discipline and by World Area, 1976-81....157
4-3: Policy-Relevant Publications of Center Faculty by World Area, 1976-81.....166
4-4: Publications by Center Faculty on Selected Topics in Economics, 1976-81.....168

5-1: Expectations Among Soviet and East European Specialists of Being Replaced by Area Specialists, by Discipline.....192
5-2: Number of Faculty Spending More Than 25% and Number of Faculty Spending 25% or Less of Their Time on Center Activities.....194

5-3: Number of Courses by Size of Enrollment in 39 Title VI Centers by World Area, 1982.....199
5-4: Title VI Expenditures, 1973....................202

6-1: Estimated Holdings of Title VI Center Libraries, 1981-82.............................238
6-2: Expenditures of University and Title VI Funds by Title VI Centers on Library Acquisitions, 1981-82..................................240
6-3: Expenditures of Title VI Funds on Library Staff by Title VI Centers, 1981-82..........242

Preface

The Association of American Universities is pleased to present a report that addresses an aspect of higher education that is both vital to our national well-being and to the current issues of intellectual direction and the internal economies of all of our member institutions. Few matters have come up with such regularity and with such a sense of impending crisis on our individual campuses, in various sections of government, and in the private foundations as has the condition of our national resource base for language and area studies. It is in this context that we welcomed the initiative of the U.S. Congress, the Department of Defense, and the National Endowment for the Humanities to undertake a comprehensive survey--as comprehensive as a year's working time would allow--of the current status of language and area studies in the United States. We view this as a matter of major national importance and while we address quite specifically the special concerns of the federal agencies who have initiated this inventory--the Department of Defense and the National Endowment for the Humanities--as well as some others who are concerned with language and area studies, it is from the broader perspective of the national interest that this report is written. The resources of the great universities, various federal agencies, and the private foundations have for several decades joined to create a unique national resource for advanced research and teaching about other parts of the world. It is time that a major assessment was undertaken.

The initiative for this report came from the Working Group on Foreign Language and Area Studies of the Department of Defense/University Forum, a group founded for the purpose of enhancing communication between the Department and a number of institutions whose activities in research and training are critical to the mission of the agency. That a group designed for that purpose would address this issue as one of its first concerns reveals an encouragingly broad and enlightened view of the elements that make up the nation's security.

This report concentrates on the present capacities of the nation's universities for advanced training and research in foreign language and area studies. Another part of the project, conducted by SRI International and printed separately, assessed the need within the Department of Defense for new knowledge and trained people in those fields; the major findings of the SRI report have been incorporated into the current document. The principal conclusion of the two efforts is that the fit between the needs of the Department of Defense and of the academic community is not perfect; it probably never can be given the pace, perspectives and styles of university programs and the rapidly shifting needs of those responsible for national security. Neither, however, are the two so far apart as to cause one to conclude that there is an unbridgeable gap. Rather, there is reason to be optimistic that universities can be helped to do better what they are supposed to do, and that by doing so they will make an enhanced contribution to the nation's security and foreign policy.

The national concern for the humanistic aspects of our relations with the rest of the world is reflected in the detailed analysis of the current state of our foreign language competencies and of the important research and teaching concerning the other great civilizations of the world. Indeed, the report illuminates how the humanistic portion of our universities and the federal agencies that relate to it have together created an especially impressive enrichment of our international understanding.

More generally, the report documents the overall

13

condition of university programs in language and area studies and recommends strategies for strengthening them. The main, organizing conclusion is foreshadowed in the report's title, "Beyond Growth." The assertion that the period of expansion in programs of international and foreign area studies is over and that the main goal of policy should be to sustain the base and improve its quality in various ways will surely invite debate. And so it should. We are long overdue for a serious debate about how to deal with these fields that are simultaneously central to the way in which universities define themselves intellectually and to important interests of the nation. That discussion is continuously in progress with respect to science and technology. It is time for its scope to be enlarged, and this report should make an important contribution toward that end.

Robert M. Rosenzweig
President, Association of American Universities
April, 1984

Acknowledgements

This report could not have been finished in less than a year's time without the cooperation and assistance of a great many people. We are especially beholden to those who supplied us with detailed information about their own organizations and their roles in support of language and area studies. These include: Harold Cannon and Stanley Turesky of the National Endowment for the Humanities; Ann Schneider, Richard Thompson, Joseph Belmonte, John Paul, Robert Dennis, and Marion Kane of the Department of Education; Cassandra Pyle and Anne Carpenter of the Council for International Exchange of Scholars; Francine Berkowitz of the Smithsonian Institution; Raymond Platig of the Department of State and Christopher Paddack of the United States Information Agency; Ruth Zagorin of the Agency for International Development; Warren J. Haas and Richard De Gennaro, of the Council on Library Resources and Research Library Group, respectively; Lorraine McDonnell of the Rand Corporation; Kenneth Goody and John Stremlau of the Rockefeller Foundation; Richard Brod of the Modern Language Association; and Warren Eason of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.

A supplemental report, "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe," prepared by SRI International in 1983, provided extremely useful insights and information on language and area studies resources and needs within DOD which complemented the project team's survey of campus-based activities. In addition, William B. Bader of SRI International accompanied the site visit team to several campuses.

We are grateful to Robert L. Payton and Arne R. Shore of the Exxon Education Foundation and to William D. Carmichael and Enid C. B. Schoettle of the Ford Foundation for hosting a conference for us where we had the opportunity to discuss our preliminary findings and recommendations with several "old hands" in the private foundations long experienced in funding language and area studies. Their reactions and advice were both humbling and helpful. Arne Shore deserves special thanks as a faithful reader and constructive critic of the numerous drafts of this report.

Among the staff of the Association of American Universities, special thanks must go to David Forsythe for his extensive assistance with the computerization of the data and for managing the complex computer communication facilities that were involved in running a project with two headquarters. Sarah Moore managed the computer operations at the University of Pennsylvania. Allen Browne and Joyce Madancy created and massaged most of the tabulations appearing in the report, and they and Mary Yates edited the final text. Tanyi Bumbray served superbly as secretary for the project.

Above all, we want to thank the campus-based international studies officers and their staffs who made our site visits possible, often on very short notice, and our colleagues in the field for their cooperation and forbearance in the face of our extensive demands.

1
Preamble

George Washington's injunction to America to avoid foreign entanglements may have been good advice in the eighteenth century, but in today's world, the cosmopolitanism of Jefferson and Franklin is more appropriate. Every day yet another international crisis on the front page of our newspaper reminds us that insular America disappeared with high-button shoes.

Our armed forces are deployed in many countries throughout the world, and in many places they are in a state of semi-siege. Units of our fleet are permanently stationed in each of the seven seas, and our ships rush toward yet another shore as each new international brush fire ignites. Around our bases in Europe swirl the eddies of political controversies. For the first time since colonial days we have a durable adversary in the Soviet Union, which acts as a lodestone for all of our foreign policies.

A significant and growing portion of our national product is sold abroad, but many of our customary markets, both domestic and overseas, have been increasingly penetrated by aggressive foreign manufacturers and exporters. The well-being of our major banks hangs on the internal economic policies of countries that some of our citizens have barely heard of and few know much about. Workers in Detroit and Gary are on unemployment lines because of the price of labor, managerial styles, and public policy in Tokyo, Taipei, Seoul, and Tijuana.

Our physicists use multinationally owned cyclotrons. Our space flights are monitored and our weather forecasts emanate from stations manned and operated by many nations. And at home, yet another wave of immigration reminds us that we ourselves are now and always have been a shifting mosaic of ethnic groups with unsevered ties to their homelands.

It is this imperative of a growing international dimension to much of American life that has led to the development of two occasionally interrelating but usually quite separate sets of institutions--one on the campuses and one within the government--dedicated to the creation of an organized body of knowledge about other parts of the world and of a set of people to generate and interpret that knowledge. To understand how these two systems came about, a little history is in order.

THE HISTORICAL SETTING[1]

The first organized accumulation of knowledge by Americans of the languages, histories, and folkways of distant parts of the world occurred as part of the launching of the American Protestant missionary enterprise in the opening decades of the nineteenth century. Most of what Americans knew about India, China, the South Seas, and the Middle East, they knew through the mediation of missionaries, some of whom--the "missionary literati"--became accomplished linguists and ethnographers in the course of their ministries. Although the missionary enterprise peaked just prior to American entry into World War I and thereafter declined as a force in American intellectual and religious life, 35 years later American military officials found themselves heavily dependent upon American missionaries and the children of missionaries who had been stationed in Korea for translation services needed during the armistice talks at Panmunjom in 1953. Many of today's leading academic experts and government officials dealing with East Asia--not least the current Ambassador to the People's Republic of China--trace their familial and intellectual roots to this once rich source of

American knowledge about "the heathen world."

Sustained American academic interest in distant parts of the contemporary world dates from the 1890s, when Archibald Cary Coolidge sparked Harvard University's curiosity about Russia and the Slavic world generally; interest in the biblical world and that of ancient India can be traced back considerably farther. By the early 1900s, Yale and Columbia University embarked on what has since become their substantial commitment to the study of East Asia. Shortly thereafter, the University of California established itself as an important center for the study of Latin America, while the University of Chicago, with the creation of its Oriental Institute in 1923, became an important center for the study of the Middle East and South Asia. By the 1930s, the University of Pennsylvania began to acquire the intellectual wherewithal that later allowed it to become another leading center for the study of South Asia, while Northwestern was gathering the resources to become the first American university with a substantial commitment to the study of Africa. Yet none of these academic initiatives was so substantial on the eve of World War II that it was assured survival, much less additional support. Although by 1940, American universities had produced some 400 Ph.D.'s in specialties we now think of as falling within international studies, the enterprise itself struggled along on a semester-to-semester basis.

Equally important, if equally tentative, were initiatives undertaken during the interwar years by governmental agencies in dealing with the world beyond America's borders. With the passage of the Rogers Act in 1924, which joined the Diplomatic and Consular Corps into the Foreign Service while removing it from the vicissitudes of partisan politics, a representative of American diplomatic interests abroad could for the first time look forward to a career of sufficient length to undertake the training necessary to become a specialist in a particular world region. Among the first to exploit this possibility of "an intellectual career in the Foreign Service" were George F. Kennan, Charles Bohlen, Loy Henderson, and Llewellyn Thompson, all of whom eventually served on the Russian desk at the State Department and represented the United States in Moscow.

It was in the late 1920s and 1930s that the State Department had at its disposal a cadre of young diplomats ready, willing, and linguistically able to devote their careers to representing American interests in East Asia. In the case of Latin American studies, the initial federal impetus came from the Inter-American Affairs section of the State Department under the leadership of Nelson Rockefeller and others.

LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES IN THE MILITARY[2]

The interwar years also marked the point at which the military services first moved, however cautiously, to meet their needs for linguistically equipped regional specialists in their ranks. The Navy proceeded to provide language training for a select number of its officers in Japan, China, Manchuria, and, prior to the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States in 1933, Latvia. Meanwhile, in the Army, the careers of both Joseph Stilwell and David B. Barrett attest to the fact that the Army General Staff was careful to maintain someone in its ranks who legitimately qualified as an "expert on China affairs." Kurt Müller of the Modern Language Association has recently documented these early days, with particular reference to language study in the Defense Department.

With the onset of World War II, the overseas training programs for military personnel moved to the United States. For instance, training in Japanese moved first to Berkeley and Harvard, then to schools on military installations. In addition to the schools that provided only language skills, there were a dozen programs run by the Army and the Navy to prepare officers for service in civil affairs and military government. Individuals selected for their professional or administrative skills were given some language training and some area familiarity with the country--mostly European countries--where they were expected to be based.

The first program run by the Army was established at the University of Virginia. Later, Civil Affairs Training Schools, as they were called, were established at Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Chicago, Michigan, Pittsburgh, Boston, Northwestern, Case Western Reserve, and Wisconsin. At the same time, the scope of the war extended to countries around the world in which our nation had had little interest and even less experience. In order to train specialists in the languages and societies of these countries, the Army turned to the campuses where such expertise was more likely to reside.

In December 1942, Secretaries of the Army and the Navy jointly announced the establishment of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) on a large number of American campuses. In part, the initiative for this program grew out of a national concern that a generation of American youth who would normally have been attending college would be missing that experience, with serious consequences for the future pool of military and national leadership. This concern for the national resource base of educated manpower was the same rationale that led the Army in 1945-46 to establish from scratch a full-blown American-style university in Biarritz, France, complete with American faculty, courses for college credit, books, and several thousand GI students.

The correspondence leading up to the establishment of ASTP indicates that the Army was not only concerned about its own needs, but saw a need for a national pool of competencies in five specialties: mathematics, physics, electricity, engineering, and languages.[3] As we will note below, it is interesting that these are almost the same topics about whose well-being on American campuses Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger expressed concern exactly 40 years later.

While the ASTP programs trained engineers, mathematicians and psychologists, our interest here is in the training of specialists with high levels of skills in a wide variety of languages, and, as it turned out in practice, some familiarity with the area in which the languages are spoken. Between June 1943 and December 1945, some 16,307 members of the armed services had been trained in one or another language and area specialty. Müller reported: "In all, fifty-five colleges and universities ran language and area programs for ASTP, in up to nine languages; most offered programs in three languages."[4]

The bulk of the training--a minimum of 60%--comprised intensive language instruction, but courses were also given in the history, society, culture, and politics of the countries whose language was being studied. So limited was our national resource base at the time that on many campuses, both the language and the area teaching materials were being created at the same time the instruction was being given; finding a full complement of qualified teachers on such short notice was not easy. In one program in Turkish studies, for instance, almost all of the area studies teachers were of Greek or Yugoslav origin, with a consequent view of Turkish history that might be imagined.

The prototype of the comprehensive language and area studies program had been born: it was campus-based; it trained students in an integrated program combining language instruction with a variety of disciplinary survey courses concerning a country or a region; the teaching staff were members of the regular faculty of the institutions where they taught; the rationale for the program was to train scarce manpower; and basic support for the program was the responsibility of the federal government. The institutions where ASTP programs were located and the languages they taught are given in Appendix C.

POSTWAR PROGRAMS AND RAPID GROWTH

It is interesting that these crash programs, so quickly assembled during the war, could disappear without a trace almost as quickly. The Biarritz University was completely dismantled within a few months of the final victory in Japan. The ASTP fell victim to a sudden acute shortage of manpower for regular military duty, especially in Europe in the winter of 1945. However, although ASTP and the Navy's Civil Affairs Training schools were disbanded in the final months of the war or in its immediate aftermath, their impact was of lasting importance. Earlier American interest in distant parts of the world could be--and often was--attributed to the lure of the exotic and reflected a certain distaste for America. These wartime programs demonstrated that such interest could also become a crucial component in any future mobilization of American society.

Moreover, the universities that housed these programs had become fully persuaded that for both intellectual and patriotic reasons, there should be no return to the pre-war academic status quo. With the war still on, Columbia University officials had arranged with the Rockefeller Foundation to help establish the Russian Institute in Morningside Heights. Officials at Michigan, Berkeley, and Harvard were equally determined that "the lessons" of the war--chief among them that vigilance has an intellectual as well as a military component--not be lost on those who enjoy the peace.

The years immediately after World War II mark the take-off of American international studies as an academic enterprise. Between 1948 and 1951, the number of international studies Ph.D.'s produced by American universities annually more than doubled, from around 100 in 1948 to 225 in 1951. It doubled again between 1955 and 1965, then doubled once again by 1970. These substantial increases in manpower trained as specialists were a result, in part, of the growth and widespread diffusion, roughly following the ASTP model, of organized programs on many campuses.

In 1947, Robert Hall, in a national survey for the Social Science Research Council, counted only 14 organized language and area studies programs on American campuses: 6 for Latin America, 3 for Eastern Europe, 1 for South Asia, and 4 for East Asia. By 1951, modest growth had occurred. Wendell Bennett, using Hall's criteria in another enumeration for the Social Science Research Council, counted 25 organized language and area studies programs, an increase of 11 centers in 5 years. Bennett reported that there were a few more programs in East European and East Asian studies, but more important, coverage of the Middle East, Africa, and South Asia had begun.[5]

In the 1960s, campus-based language and area studies expanded immensely. The number of organized campus-based language and area studies programs increased to about 600 self-identified programs, or about 300 that met the minimal organizational criteria for a strong program as defined by Hall and Bennett. The major impetus for this growth was the intellectual engagement of American higher education internationally, particularly with the Third World and its development efforts. The bulk of the investment in this expansion of the international component on the campuses was made by universities and colleges out of their own resources, and by individual professors and students out of their time and interest.

Nonetheless, external financial support played a crucial catalytic role. In the first decades after World War II, financial support for campus-based language and area studies came primarily from private and state sources. Both the Rockefeller Foundation, which had been underwriting international studies on American campuses since it helped found the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago in the 1920s, and the Carnegie Corporation, whose grant to Harvard University in 1948 for its Russian Research Center--$740,000--was the largest of its kind to date, made heroic efforts to support the enterprise as it attempted to establish itself as a permanent fixture on American campuses. Similarly, state legislatures, particularly those of Michigan and California, tried to help their universities develop facilities in international studies competitive with those of the private eastern universities.

A crucial development in the history of campus-based language and area studies programs occurred in the early 1950s, with the emergence of the recently reorganized and greatly enriched Ford Foundation as the principal outside underwriter of such programs. Between 1953 and 1966, when its International Training and Research Program was terminated, the Ford Foundation made grants exceeding $270 million to some 34 universities specifically and exclusively for international studies, a substantial portion of it in support of language and area studies.

Once ASTP had collapsed and its training functions had been taken inside the federal agencies, federal support for campus-based language and area studies disappeared, despite assurances from national officials, including a Presidential Commission in 1943, that such highly trained individuals were a valued national resource. It was the unanticipated Soviet launching of the satellite Sputnik in 1957 that made the federal government realize that it had a major stake in creating and sustaining a substantial body of experts who could follow events in other countries using materials in the languages of those countries, and who were familiar enough with those societies to interpret these materials. The subsequent enactment in 1958 of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) to create and maintain such a pool of expertise immensely encouraged the growth in the number of specialists trained on the campuses and sponsored the creation and maintenance of a substantial number of organized programs, roughly following the ASTP model.

The result was the creation of a network of institutions unmatched anywhere in the world, a national resource whose loss would immensely impoverish the capacity of our democratic society and our government to understand the complex, interrelated world in which we live. In addition to the training of specialists, these centers provide instruction about other countries to a substantial portion of the future electorate; provide a catalyst for internationalizing the perspective of primary and secondary education; inform the general public on important national events in the countries they study; serve the media and the public policy makers; assemble library and resource materials on other parts of the world; establish and maintain training facilities used by government and private sector organizations as well as by their own students who require overseas experience; and provide durable overseas linkages with scholars and political leaders in the service of our long-range public diplomacy.

Much of the enormously enriched information base mobilized for their clientele by "information intermediaries," such as free-standing translators, language training institutes, research contractors, and consultants--for example, consulting firms in economics, accounting, management, marketing, and business information services--was created or assembled by language and area specialists. Moreover, a great many non-area specialists now employed in the private and public sectors have had one or more courses providing them with some exposure to foreign area studies and familiarizing them with specialized information sources in these fields. Business firms, including law firms, banks, the "information intermediaries," and government agencies, tap the specialized knowledge of area experts with some frequency through ad hoc consultation, or, less frequently, retainerships. The libraries of the major institutions are also relied upon as a source of area information on an as-needed basis. The language and area studies efforts have built an ample and complex infrastructure of skills and information, one that yields, as economists would put it, rich externalities to consumers of this information and expertise in both the public and private sectors.

THE END OF RAPID GROWTH

In the late 1960s, the expansionary mood, both in higher education in general and in language and area studies in particular, changed. For language and area studies, a turning point came in 1967. This was the year in which the Ford Foundation brought its vast International Training and Research Program to an end--though grant funds continued to be used for a good many more years--and the International Education Act (IEA) was passed without subsequent appropriation of funds. What this meant, in effect, was that in the next decade, the universities picked up the ball that the federal government and private foundations had dropped.

To a surprising extent, the universities assumed the costs of language and area studies programs; not surprisingly, the number of such programs ceased to grow and may have declined. The definition of what constitutes a program is so imprecise that an exact number of centers at a particular time or over a period of years is impossible to come by. The evidence of various surveys does suggest that the growth in the number of programs slowed down and possibly has reversed. For one thing, in 1973, the number of language and area centers for which federal support was provided under NDEA Title VI was cut from 107 to 46; the number has crept back to 76 in 1983 as the Title VI appropriations increased.[6] With this cut, the federal government compounded the scarcity of funding created when the IEA bonanza did not materialize, although most of these IEA funds were not earmarked for the support of language and area studies.

Overall, language and area programs have lost out in the competition for external funds, both absolutely and compared with other sections of international studies. A 1981 Rockefeller Foundation survey reported:

> Institutions dealing with economics and political studies have maintained their purchasing power better than those concerned with security or area studies; of the latter the university affiliates performed poorly. Among the area centers... some have done better than others; centers concerned with the Middle East, Canada and Asia have increased their purchasing power; those dealing with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Africa, Latin America, and especially Western Europe, have lost ground--an unexpected development.... [I]n general, university-based area study centers--representing more than half the total--have suffered more from inflation than

> other institutions and may be in financial difficulty as a result.[7]

The Rockefeller Foundation survey, which asked for detailed information for the years 1970-80, also asked the program directors to make some estimate of the future availability of various types of funding in real dollars over the period from 1980 to 1982. The survey's conclusions in this regard are dramatic. "Over-all, the survey indicates that steep declines are expected in real terms of many sources of funding for both kinds of institutions [university affiliates and independent institutions]. Area studies centers anticipate a disaster." More precisely, area studies centers anticipated declines of 18% in endowment income, 20% in university subsidies, 11% in private foundation funding, 22% in corporate funding, 55% in government funding, and 30% in individual contributions, for a total decline of 28%.[8]

It was indicated above that it is not easy to define programs or centers and is therefore difficult to count them. A recent tabulation of Latin American programs by Gilbert W. Merkx is helpful in this regard. Merkx sorted these programs into three tiers: 20 graduate-level comprehensive programs largely defined by their Title VI connection, past or present; 40 with segmental graduate teaching and research capacities; and 120 or so exclusively engaged in undergraduate instruction.[9] Owing to its mandate to examine the resource base for "advanced research and training" in language and area studies, the present review will concentrate on the upper tier of programs. However, it should be remembered that there are a large number of programs serving the public interest that perform different functions. We shall have something to say about this matter at the appropriate time.

Counting the existing pool of individual specialists is even more difficult, more prone to boundary problems, than the enumeration of organized programs. No exhaustive inventory of the total number of specialists has been undertaken since 1970. At that time, the estimate of the total number of language and area specialists was about 13,000.[10] Barber and Ilchman estimated that there were about 17,500 Ph.D.-trained specialists in 1979, which is in general agreement with the total membership of the area studies professional associations of 18,350.[11]

The comparisons over time within world area study groups carry some of the same definitional problems but probably have a somewhat smaller range of error. For instance, the Language and Area Studies Review (LASR) counted 2,218 specialists on Soviet and East European studies in 1970.[12] Warren Eason in his 1981 "A Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States" counted 3,500 specialists.[13] Gilbert Merkx presented a very useful tabulation of different estimates of Latin American specialists over time: the National Directory of Latin Americanists for 1965 listed 1,884 specialists; the LASR, (with data compiled for 1970) enumerated 2,118 specialists in 1970; the Directory of Latin American Studies Programs and Faculty in the United States had 2,054 entries in 1975; the professional members of the Latin American Studies Association numbered 1,764 in 1983; and the Latin America Panel of the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies estimated 1,875 specialists in the same year.[14]

The evidence suggests, then, that while there was substantial growth in the number of programs and specialists in the late 1950s and the 1960s, this growth tapered off in the 1970s and 1980s. We will consider in detail in future chapters what the minimal number of programs, specialists, and students should be.

LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES TRAINING IN THE DEFENSE COMMUNITY

It is curious that this rich national resource that was growing on the campuses in the immediate postwar period had little direct connection with the military or the intelligence community. Rather, these organizations preferred to develop in-house resources to train their own personnel who needed language and area competencies.

The details of those resources, their organization, and their purpose are examined in the report conducted under a sub-contract with the present survey by SRI International, entitled "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe." The general outlines of the training resources can be quickly sketched in.

> The largest and most important--indeed, the central--agency for language training within the Department of Defense is the Defense Language Institute (DLI), at the Presidio of Monterey, California. A DOD-level organization, DLI serves all four of the armed services (i.e., including USMC), as well as a few other executive branch agencies. DLI's primary mission is to conduct a full-time resident foreign language training program, and to develop and offer non-resident language programs for DOD personnel.
>
> Since its establishment some forty years ago--originally as an Army language school--DLI has graduated over 120,000 students from its various resident military language programs. At present, it is training approximately 5,000 students a year.... None of the services has anything comparable, although the US Army Russian Institute in Garmisch, Germany, a two-year study program, does include considerable language training....
>
> DLI aims at producing solid Level 2 language proficiency (by Department of State, Foreign Service Institute standards), which DLI considers the equivalent of six years of college language training....[15]
>
> DLI seeks to develop proficiency in the four separate language skills of reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension. To this end, students attend classes five days a week for six hours each day, with an additional three hours of nightly homework. The average class size is seven, with the number of students in

> each class ranging from a single individual to ten (the maximum allowed). Most of the basic language courses run from 24 to 47 weeks in length.... DLI does not teach area courses per se, but as an adjunct to language training there is an effort to provide an introduction to foreign culture: customs and habits, philosophy and way of life, demographics, geography, and so forth.[16]

Unlike language training, area training in the services is decentralized. The Army, with its greater need for on-the-ground intelligence and operations, has the most extensive training program for officers who will spend from 12 months to an entire career as Foreign Area Officers. The Air Force and the Navy feel that they have less need, and thus have less extensive programs.

> Army area specialty training involves several related phases, conducted under various auspices. Officers receive language training at the Defense Language Institute and six months of specialized area training at the Army's Foreign Area Officer Course at Fort Bragg, N.C. They may also attend high level courses at foreign military staff colleges. Selected officers, perhaps half of the army's area specialists, will be sent to obtain a graduate level degree in a foreign area-related academic discipline. Perhaps as many as 50 to 60 of these are attending fully-funded graduate programs at as many as 40 colleges or universities of their choice that have acceptable area study graduate programs; the specific colleges will vary from year to year and student to student. Another 40 students may be enrolled in a cooperative degree program at Campbell University, N.C., linked to their course work at the FAO course at Ft. Bragg, and another 20-25 in a similar program with Georgetown University tied in with their assignment to the U.S. Army Russian Institute at Garmisch, Germany. Still another three

dozen officers who will be teaching at the U.S. Military Academy in related disciplines, are attending graduate schools under a joint USMA-FAO program.

An elaborate overseas training program usually consists of a year's travel and research in the region of specialization....

Air Force personnel selected for such [language and area studies] training, if they do not already possess proficiency in the language of the area to be studied, will undergo language training at DLI or, in a few cases, FSI [Foreign Service Institute]. The overwhelming majority of these officers will then attend appropriate courses at the Naval Post-Graduate School, Monterey, CA. Some officers will be sent under an AFIT [Air Force Institute of Technology]-sponsored program for graduate study at the MA level in Latin American affairs at the University of Texas, Alabama, or Tulane. This year, for the first time, the Air Force is funding a single doctoral candidate, in Southern European Affairs, and plans to place two more next year, in Soviet and East European studies....

Area studies in the Navy are confined to the Post-Graduate School at Monterey, with language training essentially at the DLI. Naval officers spend either a year or 18 months in the National Security Affairs Program at the Post-Graduate School, where area studies constitute an important portion of the curriculum....

The Marine Corps has a small area training program for four officers annually, one each to be trained in Russian, Spanish, Chinese, and Arabic. Following language training at DLI, these officers go abroad for a year's advanced study at the Army Russian Institute at Garmisch, the U. S. Army School of the

> Americas in Panama, the Singapore National University, or a State Department FSI facility in Tunis....
>
> The Defense Intelligence Agency, which uses a great number of military and civilian area/language specialists, does not have its own area training program. Military and civilian analysts assigned to or hired by DIA are assumed to have the requisite skills for their jobs. DIA does, however, provide considerable support in the area of skill maintenance.[17]

It should be added that most of the enlisted men and civilian personnel employed in military intelligence are really specialists in the use of passive language skills for the interception and translation of intelligence materials and have only enough exposure to substantive area studies to give context to those tasks. For others, especially in the Navy and the Air Force, the primary qualification is a technical skill in some aspect of military science with a language skill added for particular kinds of assignments.

RELATIONS WITH CAMPUS-BASED PROGRAMS

Clearly, then, except for the Defense Intelligence Agency, the armed forces have developed their own training programs for their personnel who require language and area competency. They utilize the campus facilities in language and area studies on a selective basis for some of the training of some of the officers, but, in the main, training is carried on in-house. Out of the single training program on the campus represented by ASTP, there have now emerged two highly developed language and area studies training systems with quite distinct foci representing the quite different missions of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the universities.

What is true of training is to a less extent but still largely true of the intake and utilization of information on other countries. On a day-to-day basis, the immediacy and the technical content of most DOD intelligence requirements is so high that academic research tends to be "out of sync," to quote one of the DOD interviewees, with the needs of the journeymen in intelligence working on immediate policy questions. It is unlikely that the academic setting is the proper place for most intelligence analysis. Most of it is and will continue to be carried out in-house.

The reasons for the gap between the military and academic concerns are not difficult to find. In training, the former begins with the technical skills needed for military and intelligence purposes and adds language and area studies competencies so that those functional tasks can be carried out. The latter focuses on training for scholarly research and teaching and is anchored in the academic disciplines around which universities, and graduate schools in particular, are organized. The knowledge requirements of the former are the applied and scientific aspects of military affairs and, to a limited extent, international relations. The domains of knowledge of greatest interest to campus-based language and area studies are language and literature, history, anthropology, and political science--mostly analyses of the domestic polity of other countries, as we will see. These are the disciplines most concerned with the characterization of other civilizations and societies. Hence, what the campuses can provide as part of the training of military officers, as well as other mission-oriented agencies, is contextual knowledge several steps removed from specific policy concerns.

The SRI International report indicates that the contextual knowledge produced by campus-based language and area specialists is already being used by the DOD intelligence specialists.

> Within the broad area of indirect support of the intelligence community provided by academic/scholarly institutions and individuals, one of the most obvious sources is the continuing publication of books, journals and special studies and monographs in the general category of area studies. These publica-

> tions--historical, sociological, cultural, political, geographic, and so forth--serve as the broad basis and background for analysts preparing for more specific, classified studies. While the tendency is for analysts to focus on current, more general periodicals--such as Foreign Affairs or Far Eastern Economic Review--or on technical publications, they do read some university-based periodicals, and scholarly books and journals are used for deeper research where time and analytical requirements permit or demand them....
>
> [I]t is evident that many DOD area specialists are aware of the value of scholarly publications, that they are familiar with publications in their field, and that, in varying degrees, they find them useful as general or specific background sources. In many instances, of course, such materials have only limited application to current intelligence requirements, or time constraints preclude their extensive utilization. By the same token, many area specialists are restricted in their reading of such materials to spare moments, or off-duty hours, because of their heavy workload of current materials. But there seems to be a consensus among specialists interviewed that there will be a continuing need for high-quality scholarly publications of this sort, that in an ideal world specialists would have time to make greater use of such publications, and that extensive foreign area study programs and publications provide a sound basis for the development of area specialists and for their indirect support in DOD.[18]

Whether there should be more contextual information introduced into the training process of DOD language and area specialists or in the construction of intelligence estimates is a matter for the department to decide. However, a recurrent series of inappropriate intelligence projections, particularly about Third World countries, would lead some to agree with a statement given in congressional testimony by Admiral B. R. Inman, former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and former head of the National Security Agency:

> My concern has grown as I have watched us become subject to surprise time and again, surprise where we have had insufficient assets applied to problems, and surprise because we did not understand the events that we had some inkling were underway. We have become very good at counting things, and very poor at projecting the challenges that we are likely to face.
>
> I believe increasingly that is a result of the lack of deep understanding of those societies, what motivates them, and how they are changing. The need for scholars inside the government is going to be much greater in the 15 years ahead of us than it has the past 15 years. I believe we are moving into an increasingly hazardous time.[19]

It would seem that it is in the national interest that the two systems of training and information utilization should be more mutually supportive than they are now. Some obvious areas of shared interest are language pedagogy and the collection, cataloguing, and accessing of published materials on other countries. We will have comments to make on these matters in the course of the report and in the conclusions. However, even with the current forms and extent of interrelationship, it is clear that the defense community has a major stake in the continuing vitality of campus-based language and area studies. To quote the SRI International report once again:

> Notwithstanding the conclusions stated above, the SRI project team feels obligated to underscore the strong correlation between the health and vigor of language and area study programs within the academic community and the quality of area and language specialists

within the Defense intelligence community. The intelligence professionals interviewed by SRI were presumably all products of academic institutions with strong traditions of rigorous scholarship. In all likelihood, they were beneficiaries to some extent of graduate programs that enjoyed unprecedented financial support in the post-Sputnik era--that now find themselves less well endowed. Just as these professionals reflect the qualities and attributes of the institutions where they received their training and from whose scholarship and research efforts they continue to benefit, so will the intelligence professionals who follow them.

Any degradation of the language and area study programs that produce such unique talents and subsequently nourish and enrich the quality of their work will ultimately be felt in some perhaps unmeasurable way in the capacity of the U.S. government to protect our national interest.

It is beyond the scope of this SRI study to speculate on the future capacity of academic institutions to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense for area studies and related foreign language expertise under any given set of circumstances [emphasis added]. But it is not difficult to imagine a chain of events that would once again expose the United States as woefully ill-equipped in the human resources required to meet its international obligations. Driven by a wave of post-Sputnik national concern, in the late 1950s and 1960s the Federal Government and American foundations invested heavily in foreign area training and foreign language training. The results were impressive, but just as the fruits of these area studies investments were beginning to pay off, interest shifted to other concerns and funding dried up. The full penalty for this "boom or bust" support for

> intellectual and human assets that are easily lost may yet have to be paid.[20]

This discussion reminds us of the debate several decades ago about the exploitative relationship of the Agency for International Development (AID) toward the universities that provided the technical manpower for its overseas missions. It was realized that AID was a major beneficiary of the campus-based resources for technical assistance but contributed very little to the creation or sustenance of those resources. Out of this realization came a number of AID-sponsored programs to buttress and enhance the university base of expertise so necessary to its overseas missions. We will discuss the possibility of an equivalent program of support by the DOD and other government agencies to nourish the national resources on the campus that provide the pools of expertise and basic research necessary to the carrying out of their mission.

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

It was in this frame of reference that Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger chose language and area studies along with mathematics and science as one of the domains of higher education he felt was in greatest jeopardy of decline and of greatest interest to the nation and the DOD.[21] It was in the same frame of reference that the Conference Report of the Congressional Committee enacting the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1983, directed that there be an assessment of "the national resource base which promotes the study and understanding of foreign languages and nations, in particular, the Soviet Union."

While the initial impetus and a major focus of the assessment are the needs of the DOD, it has become apparent that a number of other federal agencies are considering the question of the adequacy, distribution, and appropriate support of language and area studies. For instance, the National Endowment for the Humanities has provided financial support for the survey to assure that the humanities are thoroughly covered. The Department of Education and Congress are concerned with the future shape of Title VI as they prepare for the reauthorization hearings on the Higher Education Act. The Department of Commerce is concerned about the impending shortage of specialists on the Soviet economy. The United States Information Agency is considering its role in support of overseas research centers, which serve as in-country extensions of language and area studies programs. The Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, and some federal agencies are concerned with the forthcoming exhaustion of the excess currencies, particularly in South Asia, that for several decades have enabled them to provide substantial support for overseas research and book acquisition for language and area studies.

On the private side, many of the major foundations are considering their role in providing support for these activities. Many universities and colleges are engaged in their own review of and future commitments to language and area studies faculties and students.

Accordingly, we have attempted to take a comprehensive, cross-sectional look at the current state and future prospects of language and area studies, with particular emphasis on advanced research and training. The data available for this analysis, described in detail in Appendix B, "Methodology," comprise:

1. Interviews with administrators, faculty, and students of programs on 20 major campuses.

2. Analysis of the comprehensive descriptions of courses, enrollments, and faculty in 39 Title VI centers, for both 1976 and 1982.

3. Analysis of the five-year publication record of faculty in 72 of the 76 language and area studies centers supported by Title VI in 1981; in that year, there were 91 Title VI centers, but the 12 international studies centers, the 2 Canadian studies centers and the 1 Pacific Island studies center were beyond the scope of this project and were not coded.

4. Analysis of the transcripts of students completing language and area studies training at a large number of centers.

5. Analysis of the inventory of Soviet specialists assembled by Dr. Warren Eason of Ohio State University for the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. This survey encompasses data on specialists from 1945 to 1981.

6. Analysis of the internationally oriented research grants given by the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, National Institute of Mental Health, Smithsonian, Fulbright, and the major private foundations.

7. Special runs of the 1983 Rand survey data on Foreign Language and Area Studies fellowship holders.[22]

8. Modern Language Association tabulations of language enrollments in the less commonly taught languages, by institution.[23]

These data will be utilized to discuss a number of aspects of campus-based language and area studies. The next two chapters will be concerned with the training programs and resources that produce the basic competencies for individuals in language skills (Chapter 2) and knowledge of an area (Chapter 3). The fourth chapter, which deals with centers, faculty, and their research output, will be concerned with strengths and weaknesses in the cross-sectional coverage of areas, languages, disciplines, and topics. The fifth chapter will deal with the organizational structure of language and area studies, with special attention to centers and national and international organizations servicing the field. The sixth chapter will deal with library and information resources. The seventh chapter contains a summary of the principal recommendations emerging from the various parts of this report.

Throughout the report, our focus will be on the campus-based programs, using the federal language and area studies programs as a point of reference. We will not attempt to evaluate the federal programs, although it is clear from interviews and numerous published accounts that they, like the campus-based programs, could be improved. Rather, we will concentrate on the academic language and area studies resources. We hope that it will be constantly kept in mind that in our view, the creation and sustenance of this resource represents a remarkable American achievement, an asset of immense value for our nation. If, through neglect, we let this tremendous resource slip away, it will be at our peril.

However, it does seem appropriate to take the occasion of the end of approximately 40 years of growth and some 25 years of continuous federal support for campus-based language and area studies to see where we have come and where we might want to go next. Where has the almost haphazard mix of individual initiative, university resources, private philanthropy, and public monies applied without any overall vision of the appropriate size, shape, and focus of this national resource base taken us? To what extent have our original national goals been met--to create a cadre of highly trained language- and area-competent scholars and programs? How secure are past accomplishments, and how suitable are they for the next quarter century? What important aspects of our resource base are in jeopardy as campus economies and federal and private support contract? Are there aspects of language and area studies that are of high national interest but are unlikely to develop under the existing laissez-faire system of support and planning unless special effort and funding are applied? In short, what should the next phase of language and area studies look like?

We will also highlight those concerns shared by the two separate domains of language and area studies, the federal government's programs and those on campus, and those in which they differ, and we will consider how the two enterprises might be made more mutually supportive in serving the national interest, keeping in mind their very different functions and orientations.

In short, we will be attempting to give a cross-sectional picture of where we are, make some recommendations as to where the national interest indicates we should be heading, and finally, give suggestions as to first steps and mechanisms to get from here to there.

NOTES

[1] We are grateful to Robert McCaughey for providing some of this historical background from his forthcoming book, International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning (New York: Columbia University Press).

[2] Much of the following information on the development of language training in the military is taken from Kurt E. Müller, "National Security and Language Competence: U.S. Armed Forces and Transnational Communication" (Master's thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 1983).

[3] Ibid., p. 114.

[4] Ibid., p. 120.

[5] Robert B. Hall, Area Studies with Special Reference to Their Application for Research in the Social Sciences (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947), and Wendell Bennett, Area Studies in American Universities (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951); cited in Richard D. Lambert, Language and Area Studies Review, Monograph 17 (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973), pp. 14-15, hereafter referred to as LASR.

[6] The 1983 number does not include non-area-oriented international studies centers.

[7] Edwin A. Deagle, A Survey of United States Institutions Engaged in International Relations Research and Related Activities: A Preliminary Report (New York: The Rockefeller Foundation International Relations Division, 1981), p. 8.

[8] *Ibid*., Table XVI.

[9] Gilbert W. Merkx, "The National Need for Latin American and Caribbean Specialists: Current Resources and Future Requirements" (New York: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1983), Table I.

[10] Lambert, *LASR*, p. 11.

[11] Elinor G. Barber and Warren Ilchman, "International Studies Review" (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1979), p. 15.

[12] Lambert, *LASR*, p. 11.

[13] Warren W. Eason, "A Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States" (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, Inc., forthcoming).

[14] Merkx, "Latin American and Caribbean Specialists," p. 15.

[15] The length of time required to reach level 2 varies considerably, depending on the difficulty of the language. Accordingly, the length of equivalent college-level training also shows dramatic variations. See Chapter 2, Table 2.2, for DLI's own figures on this subject.

[16] SRI International, "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe," prepared for the Association of American Universities (Arlington, VA: SRI International, 1983), pp. 16-20. *passim*.

[17] *Ibid*., pp. 28-30.

[18] *Ibid*, pp. 34-35.

[19] Admiral B. R. Inman, cited in SRI International, "Defense Intelligence," p.2.

[20] *Ibid*., p. 6.

[21] Caspar Weinberger, speech to the National Convocation on Pre-College Education in Mathematics and Science, at the National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC, 12 May 1982.

[22] Lorraine M. McDonnell, with Cathleen Stasz and Rodger Madison. Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients, prepared for the U.S. Department of Education (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983).

[23] Tabulations taken from data used to compile Richard I. Brod's Survey of Foreign Language Course Registrations in U.S. Colleges and Universities, Fall 1980 (New York: Modern Language Association, 1982).

2
Language Competency

TWO SYSTEMS OF INSTRUCTION

Problem:
Two parallel systems of instruction in the uncommonly taught languages have grown up, one within the government agencies and one on the campuses. While they serve somewhat different purposes and do so within different institutional contexts, they can be mutually supportive. There are no established mechanisms for sharing problems and solutions.

In the Preamble, we noted the development of two largely unrelated teaching systems for the training of language and area studies specialists, one on the campus and the other in the Department of Defense (DOD). In no other aspect of language and area studies is the separation as great as in language teaching; in no other aspect of language and area studies is the possibility for mutual reinforcement and collective goal setting quite so promising and so potentially beneficial for the nation.

After the war, the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) model of intensive, short-duration instruction, with the training confined almost entirely to the promotion of language use skills, moved from the campus into the government language schools, dropping most of its area studies component as it did so. Some parts of the ASTP tradition may still be found on campuses, but, by and large, campus-based instruction in the less commonly taught languages has come to reflect the style of all other language instruction on the campus: instruction tends to be given for a few hours per week during the academic year; skill enhancement takes place over a number of years and is measured in terms of academic course grades and the number of courses or years a language is studied; the bulk of the students are enrolled in and do not move beyond the elementary skill levels; and advanced skill instruction tends to take the form of literature courses.

In addition to these differences in institutional format, it should be kept in mind that the goals of the two systems, the government's and the academic, are somewhat different. One substantial goal of the language training on campus, even in the less commonly taught ones, is for the general education of our citizenry and not for the training of specialists; this training reaches down into other levels of the educational system. For instance, if there is to be any hope of success for the current plan to train a large number of American students in the Japanese language so that they can participate in regular instruction in Japanese educational institutions, it will have to be Title VI language center teachers who make it possible. In addition, an important component of the academic enterprise with respect to the less commonly taught languages is the stress placed by some students on classical and literary forms of a language rather than on contemporary forms used as a means of communication.

A second major approach on the campus for some students is to treat the language itself as an object of study, as in linguistics or philology, instead of or in addition to the acquisition of a working mastery of the language. Moreover, even among those training to be specialists, many students are more interested in the area studies than in the linguistic aspect of language and area studies. DOD training, on the other hand, is geared almost entirely to the acquisition of a working language competency and deals almost exclusively with languages as they are in current use.

The two language teaching systems have their own mandates, rhythms, and problems. Our focus is on the campus programs. We will touch upon the government language teaching programs only by way of contrast and to point out aspects where common concerns and uneven development in one or the other system would make some coordination and cooperation quite fruitful. We do want to note, however, that the continued lack of contact between the two systems reinforces the weaknesses of each, and it is in the national interest that some vehicle be constructed for making them more mutually supportive. For instance, it is surely in the nation's interest that there be a national cross-sectional stocktaking, language by language, to examine together the teaching materials and technology for instruction in particular languages.

We note that considerable progress is already being made in the cooperative development of criterion-based language proficiency tests and the training of teachers to administer those tests. Another obvious area of mutual interest is in the development of teaching materials. The extensive listing of text materials in use in the various academic programs and the materials available in the various government organizations reported in the Center for Applied Linguistics' Survey of Materials Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages in the United States is another starting point,[1] as is the lead taken by the National Security Agency and a number of universities largely outside the language and area teaching system in the use of high technology in language instruction. However, these advances have as yet had little impact on the teaching pattern in most language and area studies programs.

Recommendation:
A series of national conferences of government and academic language teachers should be convened on an annual basis for each of the major language families. Their purpose would be to share information about problems, pedagogical technology, and materials. The hosts would be the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable on the government side, and on the academic side one or more of the national organizations, such as the Center for Applied Linguistics, the American Council of

Teachers of Foreign Languages, or the Modern Language Association, and the professional organizations of the teachers of each language.

SUSTAINING EXISTING NATIONAL RESOURCES

Problem:
The cost of teaching low-density languages is increasingly difficult to justify in traditional administrative budgetary terms. The basic reason for high costs is small and decentralized demand for instruction by students who require high-level language skills for research and other purposes. Some coverage of all languages is needed.

As noted in the Preamble, throughout this report we will be dealing mostly with the promises yet to be fulfilled, with the next development stage of campus-based language studies, rather than with its past accomplishments. It should be said at the outset, however, that the nation can point with pride to the unrivaled diffusion of instruction in what the Europeans call "little languages" throughout higher education in the United States.[2]

Much of this growth, particularly its extension into the least commonly taught languages, has resulted from sponsorship of Title VI by the National Defense Education Act, now the Higher Education Act. However, in almost every case, the primary burden for long-term sustenance of these teaching capacities on the campuses has been borne by universities out of state or private funds as part of their regular budgets. Private foundations rarely permit their funds to be used for regular salary support for such teaching positions. The total salary expenses paid out of the Title VI grants for language faculty in those programs in 1981-82 was $1,699,365; the total Department of Education Title VI grants in 1981-82 was $10 million. In other words, in 1981, 16.2% of Title VI budget allocations was spent on language instruction. In fact, the portion of Title VI grants spent on language instruction has been declining: in 1976-77, 17.7% of the total Title VI grant monies was spent on language instruction.

The first four columns of Appendix D indicate the extent of the diffusion throughout higher education of instruction in each of the less commonly taught languages, and the extent to which the federally supported Title VI centers are the sole or primary providers of that instruction.

The languages of special interest to language and area studies that have more diffuse roots in the educational system are Spanish, Hebrew, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and, to a lesser extent, Arabic. The languages almost totally dependent for their instruction on Title VI centers are all of the Central Asian languages; all African languages except Swahili and Hausa; the Indian languages of Latin America; non-Arab languages of the Middle East; Southeast and South Asian languages; and, except for places where there are clusters of ethnic interest, the languages of the Balkan and Baltic areas. As can be seen, there are a number of languages and, of course, even more dialects that are not taught anywhere in the United States.

The universities' willingness to take on these responsibilities is truly remarkable. The bulk of the support for this teaching comes from university budgets. As their financial resources have come under growing stress, all instructional programs that have a high faculty-to-student ratio have come increasingly under critical review.

There is no problem in this regard in the high-enrollment languages--we use this term in the relative sense, that is, high enrollments within the generally low-enrollment profile of the less commonly taught languages--and some, such as the East Asian languages, are undergoing an enrollment boom in many places, most noticeably in introductory-level classes. The internal economies of the universities, however, are forcing a review of their commitments to low-enrollment teaching programs, and are requiring fresh decisions as to which ones should continue to benefit from administrative forbearance from the application of strictly economic criteria. Even if one includes the high-enrollment languages, instruction in the less commonly taught languages is a prime candidate for such critical review. The distribution of language courses by class size in the 39 Title VI centers on which we had detailed information for 1981-82 is given in Table 2.1. This table indicates the number and percentage of language courses given in these centers whose enrollments consisted of 1) 10 or fewer students; 2) 11 to 20 students; and 3) 21 or more students.

Table 2.1, particularly the second row, indicates the scale of the problem facing university administrators, language and area center faculty, and the nation. In a large number of the scarce language courses, particularly those in the least commonly taught languages and at the upper skill level, enrollments are low by general university standards. For instance, out of 87 language courses at all levels taught in the South Asia Title VI-supported centers, 83 or 95% were taught in classes with 10 or fewer students enrolled in them. The equivalent figures for Inner Asia were 90%, for Southeast Asia 100%, and for African languages 83%. It is not surprising that such courses stand out on a dean's or a financial officer's charts like a sore thumb. Even for higher-enrollment languages like Japanese and Chinese, enrollments in advanced courses--the very courses usually taught by the most senior faculty--continue to be very low, while the high-enrollment introductory courses tend to be taught by the less experienced or untrained instructors.

Given this obvious low student-to-faculty ratio, and these parlous financial times for universities, it is surprising that there has not been more attrition in our national capacity to teach the scarce languages than seems to have taken place. A careful comparison of the course offerings of those 39 Title VI centers by language in 1976 and 1982 did not show a major attrition in offerings. However, there is some erosion already in some of the languages--for instance, in Turkish and South Asian languages; had we extended our enumeration

Table 2.1

Number and Percent of Language Classes By Number of Enrollees in a Sample of Title VI Centers, 1982

		SIZE CLASSES BY NUMBER OF ENROLLEES						
		1-10		11-20		21 OR MORE		
		NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL COURSES
WORLD AREA								
AF	With High-Enrollment Languages	29	83	4	11	2	6	35
	Without High-Enrollment Languages	29	83	4	11	2	6	35
EA	With High-Enrollment Languages	72	50	31	22	40	28	143
	Without High-Enrollment Languages	29	58	7	14	14	28	50

Table 2.1 (continued)

Number and Percent of Language Classes By Number of Enrollees in a Sample of Title VI Centers, 1982

		SIZE CLASSES BY NUMBER OF ENROLLEES						
		1-10		11-20		21 OR MORE		
		NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL COURSES
WORLD AREA								
EE	With High-Enrollment Languages	87	53	41	25	36	22	164
	Without High-Enrollment Languages	67	73	12	13	13	14	92
IA	With High-Enrollment Languages	19	90	1	5	1	5	21
	Without High-Enrollment Languages	19	90	1	5	1	5	21

Table 2.1 (continued)

Number and Percent of Language Classes By Number of Enrollees in a Sample of Title VI Centers, 1982

		SIZE CLASSES BY NUMBER OF ENROLLEES						
		1-10		11-20		21 OR MORE		
		NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL COURSES
WORLD AREA								
LA	With High-Enrollment Languages	24	30	12	15	43	54	79
	Without High-Enrollment Languages	14	58	4	17	6	25	24
ME	With High-Enrollment Languages	65	68	19	20	11	12	95
	Without High-Enrollment Languages	49	86	7	12	1	2	57

Table 2.1 (continued)

Number and Percent of Language Classes By Number of Enrollees in a Sample of Title VI Centers, 1982

	SIZE CLASSES BY NUMBER OF ENROLLEES						
	1-10		11-20		21 OR MORE		
	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL COURSES
WORLD AREA							
SA With High-Enrollment Languages	83	95	4	5	0	-	87
Without High-Enrollment Languages	83	95	4	5	0	-	87

Table 2.1 (continued)

Number and Percent of Language Classes By Number of Enrollees in a Sample of Title VI Centers, 1982

		SIZE CLASSES BY NUMBER OF ENROLLEES						
		1-10		11-20		21 OR MORE		
		NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL COURSES
WORLD AREA								
SE	With High-Enrollment Languages	42	100	0	-	0	-	42
	Without High-Enrollment Languages	42	100	0	-	0	-	42

Note: High-enrollment languages = Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Hebrew, and Russian.

Sample Size = number of centers analyzed out of total number of Title VI centers (1982), by world area: AF-4/10; EA-7/16; IA-1/1; LA-6/16; ME-5/13; EE-6/12; SA-6/8; SE-3/4.

to programs lower in the national hierarchy of centers, we would undoubtedly have encountered greater evidence of curtailment in language offerings.

The findings of these tabulations of courses and course enrollments were reinforced by our campus visits. In the very strong centers, most but not all of the language teaching capacity was still being preserved, although the level of staffing, particularly the ability to move positions into tenured or tenure-track lines, was beginning to weaken, and there have already been casualties at some institutions.

Almost invariably, however, we heard concern for the future, particularly with respect to staffing in the least commonly taught languages. The importance of Title VI funding in reinforcing the university's decision to maintain its scarce language instructional capacity in the national interest was consistently stressed in our interviews, although all university administrators emphasized that the academic quality of the program was their primary consideration. In a number of cases, however, the administrators we interviewed were worried about their ability in the long run to protect these language instructional programs against the pressures of the universities' internal economies.

In short, we found that the national resource for instruction in the less commonly taught languages is only beginning to fray at the edges, but there is a widely shared concern that past progress is in real danger of slipping away in the near future.

In addition to the problems of sustaining the current resource base, there are a number of highly specific agendas for the expansion into languages not yet covered. A few years ago, the Modern Language Association mapped out a phased target list of some 100 languages, sorting them into high and low priority and indicating the kinds of resources that should ideally be available in each.[3] In 1980, the Africanists surveyed the language training needs of that field.[4] And within the past few months, the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies has prepared such an overall plan for Russian.

Does the national interest lie in helping preserve the campus-based resources in scarce language instruction? One answer lies in whether the government's own language teaching and staffing is now sufficient in these languages. The final columns of Appendix D indicate 1) those languages that are currently taught in the primary government language schools; and 2) an estimate of the resources of language-competent personnel in each language in the DOD intelligence branches for fiscal year 1983. The columns marked with an "X" indicate which agencies--the Defense Language Institute, the Foreign Service Institute, the Central Intelligence Agency, or the National Security Agency--have language materials available, whether developed in-house or commercially; the assumption is that if an agency has language instruction materials, it has the capacity to teach that language subject to the availability of qualified instructors.

From Appendix D it is clear that current government capacities for some languages exceed those on the campus, but there are others where university-based instruction stands alone. There is only one African language and one South Asian language for which the DOD indicates a requirement but for which there is currently no capacity, although for many languages the number of qualified people available is below the currently projected requirements. More importantly, there are 50 languages on the DOD-generated list for which there is no expressed requirement, and there is no mention on the list of a number of the major languages of South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Africa. We must hope that there are no imminent "surges," as the DOD calls them, where a fresh "hot spot" requires language capacities not presently envisioned. More importantly, these data suggest that there are languages currently not being taught in either military language teaching schools or on the campus. Knowledge of these languages could take on major importance to our nation, even with respect to our military operations.

Reference to the DOD's sudden "surges" in demand reminds us that the lead time for tooling up to meet those surges is considerable. One characteristic of campus-based language teaching capacities, in part because of tenure rules and the general conventions of academic appointment, is that they are more durable than the staffing patterns of the DOD or other government agencies. Moreover, the government pays only the marginal costs for on-campus teaching capacities rather than the full costs it must bear for sustaining such capacities within its own staff. In addition, it should be remembered that the numerical figures on total capacity within the DOD refer only to an existing stock of specialists, some of whom will have been trained in the universities, and to people competent in these languages.

We do not mean to suggest that campus-based language teachers should be recruited into intelligence roles. As we will note more generally later, the differences in roles on both sides of the divide are quite clear and worth maintaining. It would appear, however, that the campus-based training of students in the scarcest of the languages is of mutual interest.

Given the fact that the continued presence of scarce language instruction on the campus may come to depend increasingly on the enrollment-based internal economics of the university, one obvious way to ensure their continuation is to increase enrollments to the extent that the courses are economically viable. This suggests the development of plans for either an increase in demand on a single campus or the aggregation of demand across a set of cooperating colleges. However, for many languages, increasing enrollments is neither possible nor, from the perspective of the student or the national interest, desirable. Neither the job market nor the national need is great enough to justify such a strategy. The only alternative is that more of the marginal costs of sustaining such teaching capacity must be borne by the federal government, which has a stake in its maintenance at least equal to and perhaps greater than the institution.

Obviously, some consolidation on all campuses is inevitable. Moreover, some of the current language teaching competencies already comprise second and third languages for teachers, rather than one teacher per language. More of this is likely to happen, although the quality of coverage in individual languages will probably suffer. Physical exhaustion on the part of the teacher and poor learning on the part of the student are the price of expanding the practice of making one teacher teach two or three languages at all levels. The increasingly common practice of staffing some language courses with foreign students or with visiting Fulbright scholars whose main qualification is that they are native speakers will lower the standard of instruction even further.

What surely will not serve the national interest is for every center to drop the same languages so that the national profile of available language instruction is seriously curtailed. Clearly some centralized monitoring and planning is essential to maintain a representative national corps of teachers in the less commonly taught languages.

At the same time, instruction in the least commonly taught languages is a natural domain for the development of some of the cooperative teaching ventures across institutions, and for the movement of students and faculty among institutions. There is some informal selection of languages offered among programs now, but, to our knowledge, cooperative agreements to be jointly responsible for language instruction occur only in special summer programs. Surely, if the federal government is to be asked to bear some of the costs for sustaining instruction in some of the rarest of the less commonly taught languages, parsimony urges that a deliberate plan be devised among the centers as to which program will sustain which languages, and how the teaching resources in these languages will be made available to students enrolled in other institutions. It is not unreasonable to suggest that this is one of the domains in which the government and the academic language teaching establishments might engage in some joint planning.

Recommendation:
A supplemental national support program should be devised to assure the continuation of our capacity to teach the least commonly taught languages on our campuses. Some Title VI funds should be specifically earmarked for this purpose instead of coming out of the 16% of general center support currently allocated for language instruction. Each major center receiving support should be required to cover at a minimum one of the least commonly taught languages relating to its area, with careful attention to complementarity both within the program and nationally. In addition, partially supported posts to sustain instruction in languages that are judged to be critical to the national interest would be open to national competition; be subject to sharing with an institution or set of institutions; and be contingent upon the development of a national cooperative plan for the maintenance and sharing of instruction in the least commonly taught languages for each area studies group.

We would, however, postpone expansion into new languages until some of the issues discussed below are dealt with.

PERSISTENT PROBLEMS IN CAMPUS-BASED LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

All in all, there have been remarkably few changes in the organization and technology of instruction in the less commonly taught languages. Among the problems identified in Richard Lambert's Language and Area Studies Review (LASR) that still remain are the following.

On most campuses and for most languages, there are still steep enrollment gradients by skill level--that is, in languages and programs where there is substantial enrollment, it is overwhelmingly concentrated at the first- or second-year level. With the exception of a few languages with substantial enrollments, such as Arabic, Japanese, and Russian--we omit the West European languages from this discussion since they comprise a totally different phenomenon on the campus with, alas, almost no ties to the scarce language teaching enterprise--there are few articulated teaching materials that take the student sequentially through the entire range of skill levels. Especially limited are the teaching materials and classroom styles for imparting the upper-level language skills that should distinguish the true specialist. More generally, the production of new teaching materials, with a few exceptions we will mention, has slowed down and the existing ones are in sore need of updating. The field is just beginning to face the problem of providing learning materials and instructional opportunities for professionals who need to maintain or refresh language skills lost through less than full use of the language over time.

On many campuses the overwhelming, occasionally exclusive emphasis on literary and classical languages in upper-level courses continues. By and large, skill testing still comprises achievement tests geared to the content of classroom instruction or the particular text used. There is limited articulation between domestic and overseas language training, and, in some cases, between the levels of language instruction within the program itself. There has been no sustained effort to tailor on-campus language instruction to the needs of non-academic employers who might be expected to hire the students. Very little attention has been paid to providing language instruction for adult learners, whether they be academics choosing to work in an area after their student days are over, or businessmen, government professionals, or others whose work requires them to work for long periods of time overseas.

The most satisfactory combination of the very different pedagogical skills of native speaker drill masters and American linguists is still to be implemented. In some cases we have highly trained native speaker teachers, but in many others their principal qualification is that they learned the language growing up in, or conducting original research on the literature of, their former country. There is a long-term trend of surrendering classroom instruction to native speaker teachers, many of whom have not been trained for the work.

We note that many of the mission-oriented agencies with language instructional responsibilities have faced and worked toward solutions to some of these problems, but there is so little connection between the campus and the government world that innovations on either side of the divide are rarely available to, or taken advantage of, by the other side. This is particularly true of skill testing and of the utilization of high-technology equipment to enhance the effectiveness of language teaching. The fundamental structural problem of the field has yet to be faced: dispersed, discontinuous, and low-volume demand for instruction in all but the most commonly taught of the less commonly taught languages, coupled with an increasingly spotty teaching capacity on a limited number of campuses.

It is to these continuing problems of the field that we now turn our attention.

AREA STUDY GROUP DIFFERENCES

Problem:
The needs, resources, and problems of instruction in the various languages are quite different. Hence, any next-stage planning must be tailored to the special needs of each area group. Simultaneous attention to all languages is not practical.

Before we proceed to discuss our findings with respect to the next stage of language instruction in the less commonly taught languages, it must be noted that the nature of the problems and current capacity of the teaching establishment to make the required changes vary among the different area studies groups. Latin American and West European studies programs can largely leave the problems of language instruction to the traditional Romance and perhaps Germanic language departments, although the Latin American programs have to stress the particular variety of Spanish and Portuguese spoken in Central and South America. Both they and the West European studies programs have to supplement training in the regular language departments by adding high-level spoken and comprehension skills largely through experience in the countries of the region. It is at this advanced and highly focused level that improvement is needed in language instruction for those area studies groups. Instruction in Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and Russian, on the other hand, is likely to be the responsibility of the language and area studies programs, where they are taught from the lowest to the highest levels.

There is, in fact, a continuum in the degree of development of the language teaching systems among the area studies groups. The position of an area studies group on this continuum is reflected in the size, degree of importance, extensiveness of teaching materials, and movement toward a self-conscious strategy for language teaching, as well as the level of competency that students--and faculty--are likely to achieve in one of the languages of the area in which they are expert. Among the factors that influence these differences in development are 1) the ease with which Americans can learn the language; 2) the number of languages to be covered; 3) the dispersal of learning opportunities throughout the educational system; and 4) the extent to which sources of research and sojourns in the country require a mastery of one of the indigenous languages.

Of special importance in this contrast among area study groups is the intrinsic difficulty of the relevant languages for Americans trying to learn them from scratch, reflected in the amount of time the student and the program must allocate to language learning out of the total training time. A clue to these varying levels of difficulty is the categorization of languages by difficulty level based upon the length of time American students on the average take to learn them at the Defense Language Institute (DLI). Table 2.2 presents the recent classification of languages from the least difficult in Category I to the most difficult in Category IV. These are the DLI's classifications. We, in fact, would move a few languages from one category to another, particularly in the middle ranges; furthermore, many languages taught on the campuses are not included

Table 2.2

The Defense Language Institute Classification of Languages by Level of Difficulty

LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY			
I	II	III	IV
Afrikaans	German	Albanian	Arabic
Basque	Hindi	Amharic	Chinese
Danish	Indonesian	Bengali	Japanese
Dutch	Malay	Bulgarian	Korean
French	Romanian	Burmese	
Italian	Urdu	Cambodian	
Norwegian		Czech	
Portuguese		Finnish	
Spanish		Greek	
Swahili		Hebrew	
Swedish		Hungarian	
		Lao	
		Nepalese	
		Persian	
		Polish	
		Pashto	
		Russian	
		Serbo-Croatian	
		Tagalog	
		Thai	
		Turkish	
		Vietnamese	

in this list. However, these DLI ratings do indicate in a general fashion the relative levels of difficulty of these languages and consequently the amount of time that needs to be expended by students in learning them.

To return to the basic point, the area studies groups can be ranked with regard to their language skills by where they fall on each of these four dimensions: learning difficulty, number of languages, availability of instruction, and essentiality. For instance, West European languages, including Spanish for Latin America, enjoy a favorable situation on all four dimensions; Quechua and other Indian languages (not listed in Table 2.2) have the least developed language teaching systems; and Portuguese falls somewhere in between. Russian and especially East Asian languages are more difficult to learn, but instruction in these languages is available in many locations and at various levels of the educational system; there are few opportunities for either research or sojourns in the Soviet Union and East Asia that do not require the use of the language. Middle Eastern, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and African languages, in about that order, fall on the unfavorable side in all four dimensions, although Arabic is moving toward the same position as Russian or East Asian languages and is following a similar transition on each dimension. The statement of Michael Lofchie in his summary of the special needs of African studies illustrates the continuum quite well:

> Africa has 2,000 languages, many of which have highly differentiated dialects. Selecting which of these languages should be taught on a regular basis, and at what levels, is a formidably difficult problem. Finding the resources to mount an effective program is almost impossible. Many of the key individuals involved in the administration of African language teaching programs would, if pressed to the wall, acknowledge that their resources are stretched beyond razor-thin. We are not doing as good a job of teaching African languages as we should. This is due in part to the sheer immensity of the task, and in part to the lack of language teaching materials in this area.[5]

In view of these differences in the level of development of language instruction among the various world area studies groups, the urgency of these problems and recommendations will vary accordingly. The languages that most closely meet the requirements referred to above to effect a major upgrading in instructional technology are Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. These four languages are at the high-difficulty level of the spectrum; they are essential for research in the area; and they have a substantial corpus of teaching materials, a fairly well-developed tradition of work on effective language pedagogy, and a wide range of programs that provide instruction. Accordingly, in the experimental stages of attempting to move campus-based language instruction to a higher level, and in view of the scarcity of financial resources, a starting point in the development strategies we are about to suggest would be with language teaching in these four languages. The effort at improvement can then be directed more generally over the remainder of the least commonly taught languages.

Recommendation:
Experimental programs for upgrading campus-based language instruction should begin with Japanese, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic.

A COMMON METRIC OF LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Problem:
In the academic training system, there is now no standardized way of measuring an individual's language skills. This impedes efficient articulation across the levels of training and certification of an individual's skill level. Furthermore, the differential effectiveness of pedagogical styles and teaching materials cannot be established.

We take as fundamental to the notion of a language and area specialist that such a specialist should have a high level of competency in one or more of the languages of the area in which expertise is professed. The implication of this simple premise is that analyses and recommendations should start with the production of language competencies in individuals. Given the partitioning of the academic system into semester, quarter, or academic year units, and with students moving across different levels of the educational system and often to different sites for instruction, it is time that a way of measuring the individual's language proficiency be devised that will reflect real skill levels, not just how many years of language instruction the student has had and what grades he received in the courses.

Most discussions of resources for scarce language instruction stop with the description of course offerings and enrollments by language. Indeed, these are the only data currently available on campus-based programs; even these are no longer assembled centrally on an annual basis. However, we believe that while such programmatic statistics were appropriate for the rapid-growth stage of language and area studies, they now tend to mask an important problem that must be faced. That is, if we put aside for the moment the question of the number of languages taught and total enrollments, the crucial question relevant to the creation and maintenance of a corps of language and area specialists is: how many people are already trained or are in the process of being trained to high levels of competency in each language? We mean by full competency not just the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) level 2--"limited working proficiency"--which DLI aims at, but a closer approximation to the full fluency that an educated native speaker has.

The truth is that we really do not know what the actual level of language competency of most members of the existing pool of language and area specialists is, whether at the end of training or later during their professional careers. While DLI and FSI do assign normalized test scores at the end of training, and while there has been some progress in making the rating systems in the various services and other branches of the government compatible, there are still deficiencies in record keeping. Many of the scores in individual personnel records are based on self-ratings or old test scores, and for most DOD personnel there is no record of the recency of either a test or a self-rating. Most individuals are not reexamined in a language unless they choose to be. As a consequence, in most cases, the highest rating ever achieved is allowed to stand in the record forever.

On the academic side, the only measure we have to go by is the number of semesters or quarters during which a language has been studied, occasionally with an indication of the highest year level in which a course was taken. Within the program itself, end-of-course, end-of-year, or end-of-training examinations tend to be geared to the actual material used in the classrooms and textbooks, rather than to an external criterion for the students' skill level. Moreover, even in the current system of counting years and semesters spent in class, there is little evidence of integration across the various levels of instruction. The recent survey by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) of campus-based teaching programs in the less commonly taught languages included questions on the procedures used to assess students' progress. The CAL findings are worth quoting at length in this respect.

> As would be anticipated, across both course levels, "general observation of student performance during the course" is the most frequently cited assessment procedure (99% of the total respondents in both instances), followed by "paper-and-pencil quizzes prepared by the instructor" (95% and 91% for the beginning and intermediate courses, respectively) and "end-of-term written examination prepared independently by the individual instructor" (85% and 89%). For both beginning and intermediate levels, use of an "end-of-term written examination prepared on a department-wide basis (or by individual instructors following a specified department-wide model)" was infrequently mentioned (17% and 16% respectively)... [emphasis added].
>
> Although the development of proficiency in listening comprehension was judged by the respondents as the most important and second most important teaching objective for

> beginning and intermediate courses, only 65% of the beginning course and 55% of the intermediate course instructors indicated that they made use of "a test of listening comprehension, in which the student must indicate comprehension of the target language as spoken by the instructor or given on a tape recording." With respect to the testing of speaking ability, the positive responses to both "face-to-face speaking proficiency interview such as the Foreign Service Institute (FSI)-type interview or other formalized conversation-based test" and to "a speaking test in which the student records his or her responses on tape" were quite a bit higher (especially for the former) than would have been anticipated. For both beginning and intermediate courses, 39% of the responding instructors indicated that they gave a "face-to-face speaking proficiency interview" of an FSI- or other formalized type. Although the direct testing of speaking proficiency by means of a structured interview such as that originally developed by the Foreign Service Institute has within the past two or three years begun to be known to and used to some extent by the academic community, this has been for the most part within the larger-volume languages (principally French and Spanish), and would in no event approach the frequency of use suggested by the response data. A more appropriate explanation of the survey results for this question is probably that the question was quite liberally interpreted by the respondents to include any type of general conversation with the students as constituting a "proficiency interview," notwithstanding the intended emphasis on highly formalized procedures in the original question....
>
> The assessment of developed proficiency in the language by means of an "externally-prepared standardized test" was, by all odds, the least frequently reported testing procedure at both

> beginning and intermediate levels (3% and 4%, respectively). Absolutely no use of such tests was reported for Western European, Arabic, Other East Asian, Southeast Asian, and Sub-Saharan African languages at the beginning level and for the same languages plus Other East European, Other Middle East and North African, and South Asian at the intermediate level. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the fact that, with the known exceptions of the *Japanese Proficiency Test*, developed in 1979 through a grant from the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, and the *MLA-Cooperative Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students* in Russian (developed in 1961 and no longer readily available), there are currently available no objective, non-curriculum specific, standardized tests of functional proficiency in the less commonly taught languages. (A standardized test of listening comprehension and reading proficiency in Chinese [and a similar test in Hindi] is under development through a grant from the Department of Education, but will not be available for general use until the Spring of 1984.) *In the absence of such external-to-program assessment instruments, oriented in both format and content to determining the student's ability to function appropriately in real-life language use settings, evaluation of the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of the language programs being conducted at individual institutions (or, on a group basis, within the United States generally) will continue to be both extremely difficult and of doubtful accuracy and validity* [emphasis added].[6]

We may add that there are several additional ventures afoot in the development of proficiency tests on the academic side. For example, the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has been encouraged by the Department of Education to extend its recent proficiency standard setting in the commonly taught languages to include the less commonly taught ones. We are pleased to note that staff members from the government language teaching schools have been quite helpful in this process. However, the ACTFL's work to date has been largely with the West European languages taught by most of its members, and has been aimed at creating refined gradations for the lower levels of skills that are characteristic of most high school and college-level instruction. Developing proficiency measures at the advanced skill levels and in the more difficult languages represents a fresh challenge.

In the course of a major project studying language skill attrition, fresh tests aimed at measuring advanced-level proficiencies in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Hindi are being developed by the staffs of the overseas advanced language training centers in Cairo, Taipei, and Tokyo, the CAL, and staff from several of the Title VI centers. Following the completion of tests designed to measure real-life proficiency in reading and oral comprehension plus oral production, a series of diagnostic tests will be developed for Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese.

The development of such tests is only a first step. Their use as part of the standard operating procedures of a wide variety of language teaching institutions is at least as important as the development of the tests themselves. For instance, on our campus visits, we were surprised to see how little use was made of the readily available standardized test for the measurement of proficiency in Japanese. Toward this end, one of the reasons for setting proficiency standards for admission to and graduation from the overseas advanced language training centers is that they provide excellent points of leverage to influence the rest of the academic training process in the United States, since the graduates of the state-side programs compete for scarce awards to attend the overseas programs. Even with this leverage, however, it is essential that a special effort be made to encourage the use of proficiency tests in more of the Title VI centers. We note that the guidelines for the fiscal year 1984 competition for Title VI center support are a recognition of this objective.

A further step in the direction of assuring widespread use of normed proficiency tests would be to require their use as part of the eligibility for support of a Title VI center, and from the student, some evidence of accomplishment according to nationally accepted standards as a minimal requirement for federal fellowship support at the advanced training level. However, it is our belief that unless and until the teachers of the less commonly taught languages, perhaps through their professional organizations, are committed to the creation and use of upper skill level proficiency tests, progress will be slow.

It is difficult to overemphasize the importance of developing a common metric geared to actual proficiency in a language, a metric that will not be tied to particular classrooms or styles of instruction. Within the armed services as well as throughout the government, the advantages of a common metric are widely recognized. Indeed, as pay differentials are increasingly tied to language proficiency scores, the development of an agreed upon, relatively objective standard of measurement is mandatory. On the academic side, the development of a common metric will make it possible to shift attention from the layering of courses and textbooks to skill levels of individual students. It will also facilitate the movement of students among institutions, including attendance at jointly managed summer programs, and will enhance the employment prospects of program graduates in non-academic positions since their usable language competencies could be measured and known.

A significant further benefit from reliable measurement of proficiency is the possibility of improving the teaching of languages. It would become possible to determine, objectively instead of by hunch, what aspects of various teaching methods actually work in promoting maximum proficiency for most students, or for particular kinds of students, including those most and least gifted. It is startling to note that, to our knowledge, there is no systematic, empirical, comparative testing of the various newly coined teaching methods. Surely, some controlled classroom experimentation pinpointing the effect of various teaching methodologies would be in order once a common metric is agreed upon. Classroom-oriented research on the relative efficiency of various pedagogical styles has just begun with respect to the commonly taught languages; it is still on the horizon for most of the less commonly taught languages. For some of the languages with very few enrollments, it will be some time before enough experience has been generated to norm a particular test, but a beginning can be made in the development of behavioral goals and in the creation of test items so that individual cases can be accumulated over time and classrooms and, eventually, normed tests can be created.

The development of a common metric and its application to enhance the effectiveness of pedagogy is an area of common interest for the two separate language teaching systems, that of the DOD and that of the campus. While the purposes, important proficiency domains, and targeted levels of skill will differ within and between the two systems--for instance, the particular language performance needs of cryptographers differ from those of anthropologists carrying out field research--each has a stake in developing some standardized composite and segmental measures of proficiency that will equate language skills across system boundaries. Each system has a major stake in using these common metrics to determine what works best in the classroom for particular languages, at particular levels, and for particular purposes.

Recommendation:
A major effort should be undertaken, within both the Department of Defense and the campus-based teaching systems for the less commonly taught languages, to develop a common, proficiency-based metric. These efforts should be carried on in a parallel fashion within the various teaching establishments to ensure their maximal applicability to the particular needs of each institution and language. But efforts should be coordinated on the government side by a committee of the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable, and on the academic side by existing coordinating institutions and organizations such as the American Council of Teachers

of Foreign Languages, the Center for Applied Linguistics, and the area-specific language teaching organizations where expertise can be assembled. In addition, special efforts must be made to assure the widespread use of existing tests and those to be developed. Once these measures are adopted, basic research on the effectiveness of various teaching strategies needs to be encouraged.

RAISING LEVELS OF LANGUAGE COMPETENCY

Problem:
High-level competency in the less commonly taught languages is difficult to achieve and maintain, and the number of Americans who have done so is too small. The competency of many presumed language and area specialists is inadequate. Too many students are graduating with too low a level of language competency.

Language Competency in the Existing Pool of Specialists

A widely held claim has it that Anglo-Saxons are poor learners of other languages and that among them, Americans are the poorest. Whatever the truth of this notion, it does appear to be true that for many in the pool of specialists, both those who were self-recruited after their training was completed and those whose expertise came almost entirely from training and subsequent professional experience, language skills could stand considerable improvement.

To test this proposition, we should have in hand the common metric mentioned above and some recent evaluation data on a substantial number of specialists. Without such data, it is possible only to guess at the general level of language competencies among specialists today. The most recent comprehensive data we have are self-ratings in the 1970 LASR. At that time, some 21.1% of all specialists indicated that they had no language competency at all with respect to their world area, and only 41% indicated that they could read and speak one of the indigenous languages of the area "easily." It is impossible to know whether any progress has been made since 1970. Our campus interviews indicated that some progress had been made, but how much is quite uncertain.

We do have some spotty evidence both about the current levels of competency and about change in those levels over time. In a survey conducted in 1981 as part of Warren Eason's "Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States," 13.5% of his respondents reported no competency in speaking or reading Russian (compared with 5.1% in the 1970 LASR), while 42.3% reported that they were fluent and 26.2% were above average in one or more of the languages of the area (compared with 57.1% in 1970 who indicated that they could read and speak an area language easily). The samples are a bit different, of course, but the percentages are probably not far off.[7]

In South Asian studies, we have a peer group reputational evaluation, rather than a self-rating, of South Asia scholars conducted as part of the National Targets survey under the aegis of the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies. In this survey, it was estimated that 28.6% of all the South Asia specialists who wrote books, articles, or dissertations, delivered scholarly papers, or won research fellowships were judged to have no language competency.[8] The proportion of those who indicated no language competency in the 1970 survey was 23.4%. We have no information as to whether the proportion with upper-level skills has changed very much.

While we have little comparable information on changes over time and no cross-sectional inventory of all specialists' competencies since the 1970 survey, we do have some information on the self-rated language competencies of Russian and East European specialists from the data in Warren Eason's 1981 "Dynamic Inventory." Eason used a relative scale--that is, he asked people to rate themselves vis-a-vis a hypothetical average competency rather than give their view of their fluency against some absolute standard. Table 2.3

Table 2.3

Language Speaking Competencies of Soviet and East European Specialists

	SKILL LEVEL					
	MINIMAL %	BELOW AVG. %	AVERAGE %	ABOVE AVG. %	FLUENT %	TOTAL NO. OF SPECIALISTS
LANGUAGE						
Russian	15.4	16.8	26.0	22.5	19.4	1028
Ukrainian	45.1	15.0	8.3	6.8	24.8	133
Baltic[a]	12.5	8.3	16.7	12.5	50.0	24
Caucasus[b]	27.3	9.1	27.3	9.1	27.3	11
Asian Lgs.[c]	40.0	20.0	15.0	15.0	10.0	20
Polish	43.2	19.1	9.9	8.1	19.8	294

Czech	39.4	18.8	13.1	8.6	20.0	175
Serbo-Croatian[d]	16.0	14.0	25.7	21.3	23.0	300
Hungarian[e]	25.9	9.3	11.1	9.3	44.4	54
Romanian	47.3	18.2	5.5	7.3	21.8	54

---

[a] Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian

[b] Azerbaijan, Georgian, Armenian

[c] Uzbek, Kazakh, Tadzhik, Turkman, Kirghiz

[d] Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian

[e] Hungarian, Magyar

Source: Eason, "A Dynamic Inventory."

presents the results of that survey for each of the languages covered.

The most interesting observation from Table 2.3 is that except for Russian and some of the least commonly taught languages where the specialists are most likely to be native speakers, a large percentage of those claiming a language competency put themselves at the lower end of the scale.

The comprehensive data from the 1970 LASR, plus the scattered data assessing the language competencies of the existing pool of specialists, indicate that there is a major job to be done to upgrade and sustain the language skills among many in the existing pool of specialists. This issue will be treated more fully in the next section of this chapter.

Language Competency Among Program Graduates

Let us give the analysis an even more pointed focus. Since we are concentrating on campus-based programs that train language and area specialists, we should be especially concerned with the language competencies of the graduates of those programs, with particular reference to those selected for federal support of their training, those who held National Defense Foreign Language or Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships. Recently, the Rand Corporation conducted a survey of graduates of the programs who had held FLAS fellowships between 1968 and 1979. Among the data collected were self-ratings as to language competencies. There are still some in this group (10.7%) who learned their language as children, but almost all (94.8%) had studied the language in the United States.[9]

In many ways, these data are more interesting than the data on the cross-section of specialists, since they represent the competencies at the end of training for those specialists trained in federally supported centers who themselves received federal fellowships to become language and area specialists. They should, accordingly, represent those students out of all the center graduates who most closely approximated the ideal specialist.

The 1983 Rand survey asked respondents to rate themselves at one of five skill levels for their most proficient language, ranging from 1 (an ability to use the language with great difficulty or not at all) to 5 (quite easily). Each respondent rated his ability to use his most proficient language effectively in each of the three general skills--reading, writing, and speaking. The Rand survey showed that one in seven respondents (15.3%) checked one of the boxes at the lower end of the scale (a score of 1 to 3) when asked to indicate if they could read their most proficient language of the area; that is, they could use the language to read only with difficulty or not at all. As many as one in four (24.3%) did so with respect to speaking; almost half (47.4%) put themselves at the lower end of the scale for writing.[10]

These general skill ratings are a bit crude, however, and one can get a more finely graduated rating by looking at self-evaluation of the ability to perform particular tasks at the end of training. Each respondent was asked to rate his ability to perform five specific tasks: 1) teaching a course in the language; 2) understanding a native speaker; 3) giving simple autobiographical information; 4) explaining a position on a controversial topic; and 5) describing the role of the U.S. Congress. Those who marked their performance as "use with difficulty" down to "not at all" comprised 15.4% when asked whether they could give autobiographical information; 24.6% for understanding a native speaker; 42.1% for conducting fieldwork; 54.2% for supporting a controversial position; 56.2% for describing the role of Congress in the American political system; and 64.3% for teaching in the language.[11] If these self-ratings are to be believed, it is to be hoped that many FLAS graduates will have only to give name, rank, and serial number and understand the reply. Any active production skills are performed "with difficulty."

It is impossible to know precisely what these ratings mean, but experience with these kinds of scales tells us that such statements of one's own language competency tend to be a bit optimistic. We believe that an objective measure would indicate even more clearly that a substantial number of students training to be language and area specialists graduate with relatively modest language competency. However, if one takes the self-ratings at face value and believes that a primary purpose of language and area studies programs is to produce a cadre of people with a high level of skill in one or more of the languages of the various areas of the world, it is clear that in at least some of the area studies groups, there is much work yet to be done. This is the same impression we got from virtually all of the personnel officers doing the hiring in business or in the intelligence community. Except perhaps for West European languages, the common complaint was that the language competencies brought to their jobs by a great many of the graduates of the campus-based programs needed substantial upgrading before becoming fully functional.

We noted earlier that the level of language development of the various area studies groups differed substantially. One of the ways in which these differences show themselves is in the level of language skill that is acceptable for professional status in the field. Where the implicit standard of acceptable language competency is low, as in South Asian studies or African studies, the pool of individuals, both in and out of government, who identify themselves as area experts or who publish scholarly work on that part of the world will contain many people with no language skills or very low-level ones.

The substantial number of people at the lower end of the self-rating scale is not surprising when we look at the limited levels of instruction at which courses are offered in most languages and most programs. Once again, one should keep in mind the sharp differences among area study groups. However, for most languages, there is just no training available in the upper-level language skills aside from reading courses in literature and tutorials. Interviews on our campus visits indicated that in many cases, these advanced-level tutorials amounted to little beyond assigned readings. We could not find any explicit technology or teaching materials in use outside of the overseas centers that take students to a very high level of fluency. Since, in many area studies groups, few students get much beyond the intermediate level in any event, to quote a common response in India, "the question did not arise."

Appendix E presents for each language within each world area study group the percentage of enrollments that fell in the first- or second-year, the third-year, or the fourth-year or higher courses in our sample of 39 Title VI programs. Clearly, only in the major languages do many people get beyond the first two years of instruction.

The same phenomena show up when we analyze individual student records. We examined the transcripts, without the names attached, of all of the applicants for dissertation-year fellowships under Title VI for 1983-84, some 344 applicants in all. They comprise a sample of students completing their training and going to the field for their research. Table 2.4 indicates for each area studies group the number of students whose highest-level course in any of the enumerated modern languages fell at particular levels of instruction. Only one language was tabulated for each student, so that the enumerations indicate what are presumably the highest proficiency levels attained during graduate-level coursework.

The level of development of the area studies groups is clearly evident in these figures, with only one student in South Asian studies and two in African studies getting beyond the third year. We have not included classical languages in this particular tabulation, but it should be noted that a fair amount of graduate study, particularly at the advanced level, includes enrollments in classical and literary languages. For instance, half of all of the graduate credit hours in language studies reported by students in South Asian studies were in Sanskrit. In East Asian studies and Arabic, however, the study of classical

Table 2.4

Number of 1983 Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants
by Highest Year Enrolled in Language
Course During Graduate Training

LANGUAGE	1ST YR	2ND YR	3RD YR	4TH YR
		AFRICA		
Afrikaans	-	1	-	-
Bambara	1	2	-	1
Fulfulde	-	1	-	-
Hausa	-	-	4	-
Shona	-	2	-	-
Swahili	7	3	2	-
Xhosa	-	1	1	-
Zulu	1	1	-	1

Note: French and German courses were not counted.

Sample size: 63 applicants in AF, of which 27 took AF language instruction.

EAST ASIA

LANGUAGE	1ST YR	2ND YR	3RD YR	4TH YR
Chinese	2	3	5	5
Japanese	7	-	10	14

Sample size: 58 applicants in EA, of which 44 took EA language instruction.

Note: In cases where the highest level attained by a single person was attained in two languages, that person was counted twice.

Table 2.4 (continued)

Number of 1983 Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants
by Highest Year Enrolled in Language
Course During Graduate Training

	1ST YR	2ND YR	3RD YR	4TH YR
LANGUAGE	EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR			
Bulgarian	-	-	1	-
Hungarian	-	-	1	1
Polish	1	2	-	-
Romanian	1	-	-	-
Russian	-	3	4	10
Slovak	-	1	-	-
Serbo-Croatian	-	2	2	1

Sample size: 51 applicants in EE, of which 27 took EE language instruction.

	LATIN AMERICA			
Spanish	4	1	3	4
Portuguese	3	3	2	5
Quechua	1	2	1	-

Sample size: 82 applicants in LA, of which 28 took LA language instruction.

Note: In cases where the highest level attained by a single person was attained in two languages, that person was counted twice.

Table 2.4 (continued)

Number of 1983 Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants
by Highest Year Enrolled in Language
Course During Graduate Training

LANGUAGE	1ST YR	2ND YR	3RD YR	4TH YR
		MIDDLE EAST		
Arabic	-	3	4	1
Hebrew	-	1	-	-
Persian	1	-	-	1
Turkish	-	4	-	1
Greek	-	-	1	-

Sample size: 25 applicants in ME, of which 15 took ME language instruction.

	1ST YR	2ND YR	3RD YR	4TH YR
		SOUTH ASIA		
Bengali	-	-	1	-
Hindi/Urdu	-	6	2	-
Tibetan	-	-	2	1
Tamil	-	4	2	-

Sample size: 30 applicants in SA, of which 16 took SA language instruction.

Note: In cases where the highest level attained by a single person was attained in two languages, that person was counted twice.

Table 2.4 (continued)

Number of 1983 Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants
by Highest Year Enrolled in Language
Course During Graduate Training

LANGUAGE	1ST YR	2ND YR	3RD YR	4TH YR
		SOUTHEAST ASIA		
Indonesian	1	2	2	2
Javanese	1	-	-	-
Thai	2	1	-	1
Tagalog	-	-	1	-

Sample size: 27 applicants in SE, of which 13 took SE language instruction.

LANGUAGE	1ST YR	2ND YR	3RD YR	4TH YR
		WESTERN EUROPE		
French	2	-	1	-
German	1	-	-	-

Sample size: 8 applicants in WE, of which 4 took WE language instruction.

Note: In cases where the highest level attained by a single person was attained in two languages, that person was counted twice.

forms of the language usually appears in the tabulations as fourth-year-level courses.

There are, of course, many flaws in this kind of tabulation. To the extent possible, we have excluded natives of the area who would not have to take language courses. Title VI no longer requires such training for the award of a fellowship so that native speakers can apply. Second, if we had some record of individual proficiency level, we would not have to depend upon semesters and years studied.

We are also aware that this tabulation is an under enumeration of the total language training of students. Some of them, particularly in Soviet and East European and Latin American studies, will have taken a substantial amount of their language training as undergraduates and may be taking only second languages as graduate students. Others will attend one of the overseas advanced language training centers where intensive advanced language training is available. This kind of training can significantly raise a student's language competency.

We have no equivalent data for students in other area studies groups, but in Arabic and Japanese, the most accomplished students on the average tend to reach an FSI 1+ level at the end of their state-side training, and the combination of domestic and overseas training may bring them up to an FSI 2+ or 3 level. Overseas advanced language training centers for other area studies groups will differ in their effectiveness, largely reflecting the level of development of language teaching we mentioned earlier for each particular area studies group. For instance, while there are no hard data to substantiate this, our impression is that most students are admitted to the program in Hindi after only two years of domestic study; the equivalent FSI level at entry would be well below 2, and progress beyond 2 at the end of the training would occur only occasionally. In African studies, organized overseas centers tend to operate irregularly at best, and a number of applicants for Title VI dissertation fellowships propose to conduct their field research in

English, in French, or through an interpreter. These are perfectly legitimate research strategies, but may not be appropriate at the end of the training process for students planning to be language and area experts.

While the overseas advanced language training centers help, only a relatively small percentage of students training to be specialists can attend such centers. The 1983 Rand survey reported that only half of the FLAS graduates went abroad for training, and there are no effective overseas language training centers in most of Africa, Southeast Asia, and the non-Arab Middle East. We note that military personnel training to be Foreign Area Officers are routinely sent abroad for topping off their language training. We also note that federal support for the academic overseas language training centers is uncertain. They are supported in part by student fees and dues paid by participating institutions. Federal support is largely through Title VI, but it has to be squeezed within the general category of "overseas projects," where it competes with a number of other uses of the funds budgeted. Surely more generous, longer-term, specially earmarked funding is required, and the use of the overseas centers needs to be more fully integrated into the language training sequence for more students.

In general, then, the evidence indicates that at least in several of the area studies groups, many students are acquiring a modest level of language skills in the course of their training, and in all area studies groups, some students are. Furthermore, there are few domestic programs that bring their students very high on the competency scale.

Length of Time Required to Learn a Language

The task of significantly raising the level of language skill among those training to be language and area specialists is immense, particularly for the area studies groups where the level of skill is now low. Several years ago, a carefully designed eight-nation survey of thousands of learners of French demonstrated that the aspect of language training that surpassed all others in importance in determining the skill of the speaker was the time spent in learning the language.[12] Many academics do not realize that the time and effort required to bring to near-fluency one's knowledge of the difficult languages is very great, and the proficiency required to move up each step on the FSI scale increases geometrically.

The government language teaching institutions use a sliding scale to get some rough indication of the time required to reach an FSI level 2, their target basic level of competency, using the training techniques and format of these institutions. Working intensively--that is, about six hours a day for five days a week--they estimate that in Category I languages, such as French, Spanish, or Italian (see Table 2.2 for the assignment of particular languages to categories), it takes 28 to 34 weeks of training to bring most students to level 2 proficiency. For Category II languages, it takes 38 to 48 weeks; for Category III languages, 50 to 76 weeks; and for the most difficult, Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and Korean, 50 to 102 weeks.

To put it another way, according to government estimates, it takes on the average 840 hours of class time for the first category, about 1,140 hours for the second category, about 1,800 hours for the third category, and about 2,400 hours for the most difficult languages in full-time intensive programs.

To translate this into part-time training terms--the norm for academia--direct mathematical calculation based on hours of classwork would, of course, not be valid, but there is no question that it would take many years of training to reach a comparable level of proficiency in classes that meet only a few hours per week. In fact, in the Category IV languages, there is a question as to whether this level would ever be reached in the typical university program.

As with the categorization of individual languages by level of difficulty, we make no claim for the precision of these estimates. Gifted students and gifted teachers will undoubtedly shorten the time as dull ones will lengthen it. Moreover, different classroom formats and scheduling may shorten or lengthen the time required. We do believe, however, that they present rough estimates of the amount of classroom time required to bring a student to a minimal level of competency. We will address in the next section the implications of these time demands for the organization of language instruction on campus.

Unfortunately, even these time investments do not bring a student even close to native fluency, which on the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable scale is a level 5 and is almost never achieved by someone other than a native speaker. A level 2, which is the goal--if not universally achieved--of DLI training, seems a rather minimal goal for domestic training in the less commonly taught languages. Here is the standard definition of level 2 proficiency:

> **Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements.** Can handle routine work-related interactions that are limited in scope. In more complex and sophisticated work-related tasks, language usage generally disturbs the native speaker. Can handle with confidence, but not with facility, most normal, high frequency social conversational situations including extensive, but casual conversation about current events, as well as work, family, and autobiographical information. The S-2 can get the gist of most everyday conversations but has some difficulty understanding native speakers in situations that require specialized or sophisticated knowledge. The S-2's utterances are minimally cohesive. Linguistic structure is usually not very elaborate and not thoroughly controlled; errors are frequent. Vocabulary use is appropriate for high frequency utterances, but unusual or imprecise elsewhere.[13]

Adding a year of training at the overseas centers should bring the student at a minimum to a level 3--that is, the base level of general professional proficiency. Beyond that, the amount of time and effort required to move a student closer to native fluency increases geometrically with each point on the scale.

Without FSI-like measures for evaluating proficiency of campus-trained students, we have no idea of how many specialists or graduating students reach these levels. Looking at the number of years of course work actually completed by the sample of Title VI dissertation-year fellowship students, many still have a long way to go. But there is nowhere to go. As we indicated earlier, it is precisely in the provision of the upper-level courses that would take students to this high level of skill that on-campus training is least well developed.

Accordingly, the solution has to be both in enhanced teaching facilities and in giving students the time required to gain higher levels of proficiency. While it is too much to expect that all students can or should invest the amount of time required to gain the higher levels of proficiency, we have reached the point where at least the most gifted subset of students can be expected to achieve high levels of language skill, and the facilities will be made available to allow them to do so.

We believe that the time has come to establish a higher level of minimal acceptable language competency for a larger proportion of students training to be specialists, certainly for the bulk of those receiving federal support for that purpose. In the next chapter, we will be recommending a two-tier system of federal fellowships, one tier administered through the centers for entry-level training, the other on a national competitive basis for that subset of students who will go on to become truly advanced specialists. If such a system is adopted, it would seem appropriate to tie continued support at each level to demonstrated language proficiency measured in the common metric, and, as we will note, to extend the duration of fellowship support to make it possible for the student to achieve the appropriate levels of competency.

We have no cross-sectional information, either objective or self-rated, for people holding language-related posts in the DOD or other sections of the government. What the self-ratings currently on the personnel records mean is anyone's guess. The general inventories of language and area specialists compiled by academics usually include some government personnel, and they tend to differ in what they show to be the relative competencies of government and academic personnel. The enumeration of non-academics in Eason's "Dynamic Inventory" is undoubtedly less comprehensive and less representative than for academics. In particular, those employed in active intelligence operations, especially the cryptographers who would not consider themselves area experts, would be unlikely to appear in the original mailing list or to return questionnaires to the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, which sponsored Eason's study. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that on Eason's five-point scale from minimal proficiency to near-native fluency in spoken Russian, the government employees rated themselves higher than the academic specialists (a mean score of 3.16 for academics, compared with 3.22 for the government employees). However, government employees in the sample rated lower in reading and writing skills (3.97 and 2.78 for the academics, and 3.87 and 2.65 for government employees).

Aside from these fragmentary findings, we can assume that the lower range of skills among specialists is probably less well represented among language-relevant intelligence personnel than among academics. The DLI aims for an FSI level 2 upon graduation from its school; the National Security Agency has an entrance requirement of a level 2 on its own scale. It would not be surprising, however, if the incidence of upper skill levels in the full range of competencies among DOD personnel, particularly among those whose language competency came entirely from agency training, were fairly low.

It follows, then, that the concern for the development of a cadre of specialists with near-native fluency in the languages is a problem shared by both the academic and the government teaching programs. A collaborative look at the technologies for language skill upgrading and sustenance at the higher levels is surely in order.

Recommendation:
The next stage of development in language and area studies should include specific measures to raise the general standard of language competencies throughout the field, and, in the case of the best students, provide both the time and the facilities for truly advanced language competencies to be acquired. As a goal, all students accepted for the most advanced language and area training should show by performance on a standard proficiency test a minimal level 2 proficiency. For some area studies groups, this may require an interim transitional stage to allow time for approaching that norm, but goals should be set now.

Continuous and more extensive funding should be provided to support existing overseas advanced language training centers, and to enable more students to attend them. An effort should be made to establish such facilities in world areas where they do not now exist.

A collaborative effort involving both academic and government language teachers should be launched to develop satisfactory teaching technologies for raising listening and speaking proficiency to the higher skill levels.

SERVING DIVERSE CLIENTELES

Problem:
Too little is known about ways in which language learning styles and needs of individuals are best matched with pedagogical approaches. It is fairly certain that the format and timing of present campus-based instruction is optimal for only a limited group of learners, mainly initial learners.

As we noted earlier, almost all teaching of the uncommonly taught languages on campuses takes place in regular semester or quarter courses, is carried out in a classroom setting, and meets a few times a week during the academic year, with most if not all of the students pursuing undergraduate or graduate degrees. All government language training of which we are aware--except perhaps for training at the military academies, where the organization of education approximates most closely that of other colleges and universities--is for adult learners beyond their normal student stage, is intensive, takes up the bulk of a working day, usually six hours, and is continuous, with the overall length of time spent varying by the need of the student for different levels of competency and by the level of difficulty of the language.

The various proprietary language schools that primarily serve businessmen and other individuals planning a trip abroad offer both formats of instruction, the stretched-out format typical of the academic setting and the quick intensive format of the government; they tend to concentrate on lower levels of competency that the needs and time constraints of their clients make necessary. Missionary language training, such as that carried out by the Mormon Missionary Training Center in Provo, Utah, lies somewhere in between the proprietary and government teaching systems, and the staffing of their programs presents special problems.

We do not mean to imply that there is no intensive language instruction being carried out. The survey by CAL reported that "23% of the departments teaching the uncommonly taught languages reported that 'intensive' language courses (defined as 3 or more hours per day of instruction) were being offered in their department."[14] Our site visits indicated, however, that these were overstatements. A number of them referred to special summer rather than academic-year courses. Many of these three-hour classes met only two or three times a week and included language laboratory time. In a great many cases, the term "intensive" was apparently interpreted to mean oral-aural drill sessions and tutorials, regardless of the classroom time spent. Moreover, the trend is downward. To adjust to the claims on students' time by the departments of their disciplinary major and other substantive courses on the area, language courses have had to contract into a regular course slot--that is, three to five contact hours per week.

Intensive language programs--where the bulk of the working day, each day of the week, for a full semester or year, is spent on acquiring a mastery of the language--are extremely rare in American academic institutions. The most fully developed of these are the Full-Year Asian Language Concentration (FALCON) programs at Cornell University. In these programs, the first full year of a student's language training is devoted to the study of Japanese or Chinese--or an academic year for Indonesian--thus removing the student from the counter-pressures of other instructional objectives and providing a solid start for the rest of his language training.

The success of a program like Cornell's FALCON depends upon a number of special features: the skill and dedication of a set of highly trained teachers, both native speakers and American pedagogical linguists; a sufficient number of highly motivated students whose intention of acquiring expertise on a country is clear; the development of special teaching materials and classroom technologies; a battery of tests to measure an individual's progress in mastering the language at numerous points in the training; and a willingness on the part of the university and faculty to make the arrangement administratively and financially possible. These are formidable requirements and explain in part why this model, which seems so natural a format for many of the less commonly taught languages, has not been more widely copied. A further extremely serious problem is the dearth of fellowship support available to students wishing to enroll in the FALCON programs.

In view of our comments earlier about what experience has shown to be the amount of classroom time required to achieve a minimal level of competency, particularly in the most difficult languages, the introduction of periods of intensive language training would appear to be essential. Summer or semester-long sessions may suffice for languages at the lower level of difficulty, but for the most difficult, year-long programs would seem to be required. We believe that the requisite funding and effort should be invested to support such intensive language instruction in a number of places and for a number of languages.

There is a fair amount of a priori theorizing about the relative merits of one or another teaching strategy and format, but many important questions remain unanswered. For instance, does the full-time, intensive training--whether the government's or on the campus--involve a lot of wasted "down time," in terms of both sustainable classroom attention levels and the absorptive capacity of students, ultimately limiting the effective training time? Conversely, does the academic system's slow pace and sporadic learning sequence, often interrupted by a pause of a quarter of each year in the summer, almost guarantee a very slow accumulation of skills? And, in both systems, are there ages or levels of linguistic learning aptitude at which effective learning to a full competency is very difficult for most learners?

There are many strongly held beliefs on these matters within the language teaching profession, but little empirical evidence. It is a great pity that these various teaching formats and styles have never been subjected to a careful, side-by-side evaluation to determine what works best for what kinds of students, in what languages, at what levels of competency, and with what time constraints and costs. We believe that it is a matter of great national interest that these comparative evaluation studies be undertaken cooperatively between government and academic language teaching institutions, and, if they so desire, the proprietary and missionary teaching schools.

Even within the academic system, however, there are a number of different kinds of learners and learning situations for which the present format is certainly less than optimal. We believe that it is in the national interest that our campus-based resource for teaching the less commonly taught languages should expand its capacity to serve those learners and to create new learning situations. We further believe that this is an area of great mutual interest between the academic community and the DOD and other government agencies, and, in particular, that there are materials and technologies already in use on the government side that should be shared with academics. Indicated below are some examples of the needs and new clienteles that should be served.

1. Maintaining and expanding the existing pool of competencies. It is generally typical of the American language education system that all of the attention and effort is concentrated on the initial learning of a language; there is comparatively little attention given to later upgrading or sustaining those skills once gained. To the extent that the nation turns more and more to a steady-state maintenance of the existing stock of specialists rather than to continual influxes of new specialists, a point we will turn to later, careful attention has to be given to language skill maintenance and upgrading of professionals already in the field. This is particularly the case for scholars whose trips to the field, the major current opportunity for employing and refurbishing oral language skills, are governed by the rhythm of sabbaticals. Seven years is ample time for even peak-level language skills to fray at the edges.

Fortunately, some progress is being made in this matter. A major national research project has been under way for several years to try to determine which skills and to what degree particular language skills are lost over what period of disuse. To date, these efforts have been confined to Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Hindi, and have used as their data tests and retests of graduates of overseas advanced language training centers. Having helped to create new high-level proficiency tests in collaboration with these centers, that project is in the process of developing language skill attrition-oriented diagnostic tests that will enable programs to test accurately a professional's skills at the point of entry so that targeted teaching materials and methods can be created.

The problem of language skill attrition is as pervasive throughout the government as in the academic world. Indeed, we note that there are skill maintenance programs in operation in a number of government institutions, although we have not seen what these consist of. Although we looked specifically for maintenance-oriented programs on all of the campuses we visited, we found that very few of the programs had even begun to consider this problem. There are a few programs in operation in the academic world, but these efforts are limited and are proceeding without the guidance of the basic research results needed to make them most effective.

2. Language training for academics beyond their normal student stage. It should be noted that in the past, the various area study groups were immensely enriched by the entry of a considerable flow of individual scholars into the field after they had finished their student days. Indeed, many of the most illustrious senior scholars in each area studies group began to concentrate their research and teaching in these areas after they were fully operating professionals, rather than as students. Many of them conducted research solely with materials available in English, and their own language competency was nonexistent or quite low. In most area studies groups, it is becoming increasingly difficult to do respectable scholarly work using only English-language materials. We consider this a desirable development. However, with no facilities easily available for established scholars to acquire even a minimal level of language competency, the effect is to shut off or to reduce this earlier influx of already established disciplinary scholars. A great deal of the diminution of what we are calling lateral entry into language and area studies results from a lack of interest among individual scholars in penetrating these growing guild barriers. However, nowadays, the screening committees in research fellowship competitions further this process, as does the decline of the English-speaking elites throughout the world.

The only path is to sit through an existing beginner course, but the pace is unsuitable and the timing too inconvenient to meet a senior scholar's needs. As an alternative, he might try unsupervised self-instruction. But as anyone who has tried it can testify, developing a meaningful speaking proficiency on one's own is hard if not impossible, particularly in the more difficult languages. There are now almost no organized facilities for serving this need. Nor, with the exception of an imaginative program operated by the International Research and Exchanges Board to promote the acquisition of second skills in the Soviet field, do we know of any fellowship funds available to established scholars to acquire these additional language skills. However, one problem must be pointed out, which partially explains the reluctance of senior scholars to begin the study of any of the more difficult languages. The capacity for foreign language acquisition slows down significantly with increasing age--in some instances so much so as to make the undertaking of questionable value.

3. *Teaching to dispersed clienteles.* Currently, and even more likely in the future as the capacity of a number of institutions to sustain instruction in the least commonly taught languages diminishes, the demand for training in a particular language often occurs at a location where there are no facilities for training in that language. Geographically dispersed demand for language instruction and increasingly concentrated teaching resources require the creation of innovative ways of delivering that instruction outside of the current classroom format.

There are some beginnings in addressing this problem. The historical way in which the United States solved it was through correspondence courses; such courses still exist for a number of languages, particularly those taught in high school, but they tend to stress factual knowledge *about* languages rather than develop competency in a language. Over the past few years, in Canada, where distances are great and the population sparse, faculty members at the University of Waterloo and elsewhere are spending much of their time preparing materials for correspondence courses, since the bulk of their enrollment in foreign languages is dispersed, and students and teachers communicate via audiotape. Even with this need, teaching materials there tend to be available only for some of the commonly taught languages. The only example we encountered of such a correspondence course in an uncommonly taught language was a course in Persian created and administered by a professor in the Middle East program at the University of Utah. Perhaps this option could be tried with respect to the other less commonly taught languages, but it should be realized that the level of skill likely to be attained by this method is extremely low or even nonexistent.

One attempt to meet this need is the self-instructional program. The recent survey by CAL reported:

> 26% of respondents reported that self-study opportunities were provided (defined as "student learns the language 'on his/her own,' with teacher involvement limited to occasional assistance, checks of progress, etc."). Written comments on this question indicated that in many instances the "self-study" involved independent work in advanced reading courses or literature-oriented courses, rather than self-training in basic language skills through tape recorded drills or other "programmed" means.[15]

This bears out what we found on our site visits. In the spirit implied in the CAL survey--that is, self-instructional programs structured to enable a student to develop a functional language skill largely on his own--the best such programs are those developed by the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP), and they include teaching materials, audiotapes and, for Japanese, videotapes. The most fully developed materials are in Japanese, Indonesian, and Arabic. This system requires a native driller--not a trained teacher--for oral practice, following a fixed curriculum. Under the system developed by NASILP, visiting examiners from regular, established language programs are invited to campuses to examine students at the end of each semester and to assign grades. Course credit is regularly granted by the institution.

Ohio State University has developed a variety of formats for individualized programs, now available in 14 languages. These Teacher-Assisted, Mastery-Based Self-Paced Instruction (TAMBSPI) programs utilize special instructional materials, tests, and audiotapes. A trained teacher is available to respond to questions, to conduct conversation sessions, and to give oral and written tests. An interesting variant of this system is what Ohio State calls TELE-TAMBSPI, a system using the same materials as those for TAMBSPI courses, except that the teacher-assisted component is delivered via telephone. Experiments with this system have been carried out with students of Russian and Polish, and a program aimed at faculty members has just begun.

An extension of this technology is a course taught in an interactive fashion over a telephone, with the distant classes of students and the teachers viewing each other on video screens. While such a device has been used to teach substantive academic courses, we know of no experience with this for the less commonly taught languages, and its application is likely to be limited, in the short run, to the high-enrollment, commonly taught languages where the cost of the use of video equipment on both ends is economically viable. The ultimate in such a technology would be the use of satellite communication for students with advanced proficiency, linking American classrooms with the country where the target language is spoken. Just such a beginning has been made with this technology at the University of Pennsylvania.

Computer-assisted instruction materials have been developed primarily as supplements to classroom instruction rather than as stand-alone teaching devices. Moreover, their use at present is concentrated at the introductory level of language instruction; the equipment is expensive, and the technology is at too early a stage for widespread adoption. There are, however, a number of highly promising developments under way, particularly with respect to interactive video, the learning of difficult scripts, and the pacing and branching of students through an instructional sequence. The increasing availability of the necessary hardware will undoubtedly result in greater participation of the less commonly taught language teaching faculties in this promising field.

4. Serving non-academic clienteles. Beyond the existing pool of academic language and area specialists and possible lateral professional-level recruits, there are a series of non-academic clienteles that the academic teaching resources in the commonly taught languages might seek to serve. We have in mind DOD and other government clienteles, particularly in those languages taught only on the campuses, as well as lawyers, businessmen, and members of other organizations who are willing to reach a level beyond the introductory smattering that most proprietary schools can provide.

To serve such groups, language and area programs will have to develop the capacity to give intensive courses at various levels and lengths for these clienteles. Just giving a regular course in, say, business Arabic does not accomplish this purpose, since such courses tend to be given in the regular course format and are aimed at students enrolled in the business courses. Full-length, regular courses given through continuing education schools or summer schools meet part of this need but do not really overcome the constraints: limited lead time in the generation of demand, and learning styles of adult learners. Sending such people to proprietary schools now works to a limited extent, particularly for the very early stages of language learning, but these schools rarely go much beyond the commonly taught languages. Rather, to meet such needs--and in our view the national interest dictates that they be met--the language and area programs will have to develop courses that are more flexible, more intensive, and more varied in length. Summer schools are a good place to begin such experimentation, but, in the long run, specialized teaching programs will have to be built into the regular operation of at least a few of the centers.

To accomplish this purpose, special subsidies for the development of such programs will have to be provided initially until more demand can be generated.

Universities cannot divert paid faculty time to what will necessarily be limited-enrollment courses outside of the regular accounting format, unless a substantial portion of that cost is borne externally. Conversely, it would seem a wise investment for a combination of business and other clienteles to contract for the development of such courses by providing sufficient overhead in a few places to make the operation of such facilities worthwhile.

In closing this section, we would like to reiterate what we said in connection with the relative merits of the academic and government teaching styles. As these imaginative programs multiply, serving new clienteles and using new technologies and new formats, it is essential that an evaluation procedure be built into any support program right at the outset. This evaluation should be comparative and not just aimed at a single innovative device or program. For this, too, the development of a common metric to measure success is essential.

Recommendation:
A major collaborative effort involving both the academic and the government language teaching worlds should be launched to conduct the necessary basic research and to develop satisfactory programs to maintain, reinforce, restore, and upgrade the language competencies of the existing cadre of language and area specialists.

Funds should be allocated for research, experimentation, and initial program development to make available instruction in the less commonly taught languages to a geographically dispersed clientele, to learners other than degree-seeking students.

IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATION AND FUNDING

Problem:
Pluralistic efforts to deal with the achievement of high-level language proficiency and coverage of languages can achieve only limited results.

A great deal of progress in language instruction has been made under the current system of providing federal assistance to universities to develop programs whose scope and organization is largely left to the determination of each campus. It is both inevitable and healthy that the individual university, program, and faculty be the basic unit of decision making as to the nature of language instruction.

However, this essentially laissez-faire organization of our national resources for teaching the uncommonly taught languages--not to mention the rest of the language teaching system--has settled into a pattern whose limitations we discussed above. We believe that a major catalyzing effort is required to expand and in part redirect the campus-based teaching of the uncommonly taught languages. If this is made everybody's responsibility, it will be nobody's responsibility. Accordingly, we suggest the establishment of special language teaching resource centers. one for each major language group. As noted earlier, in the initial experimental stage, it might be wise to begin with languages that are most difficult, have the largest enrollments and the most institutions teaching them, and where the language teachers are already most self-conscious, most organized, and most devoted to the improvement of language pedagogy with respect to their particular languages--Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. Eventually, however, all major language groups should be included.

We see these resource centers in collaboration with the other centers and individual language teachers undertaking many of the various tasks outlined above: 1) to create a common metric against which individuals' language competencies can be rated; 2) to conduct the basic research and evaluation of various teaching styles and programs that will help to maximize teaching strategies for different levels, students, and learning situations; 3) to train teachers in the administration and interpretation of proficiency tests, and in the most effective pedagogical strategies for teaching their particular language; 4) to develop effective strategies for teaching in new formats and teaching styles for new and existing clienteles, both on and off the campus; 5) to maintain summer and year-long intensive language instruction at the introductory and advanced levels for speaking and listening proficiency; 6) to serve as a site for periodic instruction in the least commonly taught languages; and 7) to relate the efforts of the academic teaching programs to those of the federal government.

These are tasks of high national importance. They call for concentrated effort in and of themselves; they cannot just be added by fiat or as a seed-money competition onto the edges of the existing system. There must be a locus of organizational responsibility to further these goals; wherever this responsibility lies, there must be long-term resources of both funds and personnel to be devoted to what are a set of interrelated tasks. This organization must reach into the existing network of centers where the language instruction is now taking place, and be a central place for coordination of that effort with respect to a particular language. The language-specific organizations should be able to tie into a centralized organization that has 1) a permanent core staff; 2) technical expertise in test design and administration, and in the conduct of classroom-based and evaluative research; 3) information about and resources for diffusing high-technology teaching techniques as they become available; and 4) access to a constant flow of information on what is happening in language-related research in the United States and abroad.

We see the campus-based center as being attached to an existing center, but sufficiently separate in its organization so that language faculty from other institutions can serve as short- or long-term visiting faculty or researchers, and staff can be retained for instruction in the least commonly taught languages without enmeshing them in the usual tenure-track pressures of academic departments. The assignment of these centers should be by competition, including a matching fund requirement, and for an initial five-year period, subject to renewal for proper performance.

Recommendation:
Support is recommended to establish a set of special language instruction resource centers to stimulate and coordinate innovative work in language teaching.

THE LACK OF FUNDING

Problem:
Those funds necessary to carry out many of the tasks indicated above are currently not available anywhere in the federal government or among the private foundations.

The private foundations have, by and large, not been interested in investing in the research and development necessary for the improvement of language instruction. Until recently, within the federal government, there has been almost no place to go for such support. The International Education Program of the Department of Education has some research funds under Title VI, but they have amounted to less than $1 million annually and must also be used to support all other evaluative and prescriptive research on area studies. Moreover, in part because of the limitation of funds, the International Education Program's tendency has been to fund small, isolated projects; larger, longer-term ventures that might have greater impact cannot be supported.

Research on language pedagogy has not been part of the mission of any of the other granting agencies of the federal government. The Education Division of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has supported the development of teaching materials--even this seems to be coming to an end--and the training of language teachers on a pilot program basis, but neither the Education nor the Research Divisions of the NEH can support the basic pedagogical research necessary for the transformation of the field. The Research Division of the NEH does include research related to language learning, but to qualify for funding under the NEH's research program, work must be on literature or linguistic features of the language, not language learning itself, and, in particular, not on anything measuring language proficiency or evaluating the effectiveness of alternative methods of language teaching. Even though almost half of the humanists on our campuses are engaged in language instruction, as a research topic, language instruction is not a humanity! Even when the staff of the NEH chooses to encourage the submission of such projects, the screening committees tend to weed them out. In the subsequent chapter on research, we will analyze the past allocations of NEH research monies with respect to the less commonly taught languages.

The National Science Foundation's (NSF) linguistics section might have been expected to be interested in language pedagogy, but is not. As in the NEH, the moment a research topic becomes applied, and particularly when it touches upon language testing or pedagogical research, it falls outside of the self-defined mission of the NSF. We will also detail the pattern of NSF funding with respect to the uncommonly taught languages in the chapter dealing with research.

For most of its history, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education was not interested in language instruction. Although it is now interested--and it has recently awarded a grant for the creation of a major proficiency testing center for the commonly taught languages--its funds are extremely limited. Moreover, it has the same bias as the NEH; it will fund experimental action programs, but not the basic research to inform those programs before they are created.

The National Institute of Education, which does fund pedagogical research and institution formation, has traditionally limited itself to secondary and primary education, to the commonly taught languages, and to bilingual education. Moreover, that agency has had drastically reduced funding over the past several years so that a new definition of scope is unlikely.

Recently, the National Security Agency has begun awarding funds for research on language pedagogy. It has been particularly active in promoting the use of high-technology instrumentation in language instruction and in the establishment of criteria for proficiency testing. However, the guidelines, priorities, scale, means of application, and durability of this funding program seem unclear to many in the field. Moreover, it seems odd in terms of national policy that the only substantial funding for research in language pedagogy should come from an intelligence agency.

We would like to make the point at its most general level. Somewhere in the federal government, there should be an organizational unit responsible for working toward a coherent national policy with respect to the development of our national capacity to teach the uncommonly taught languages--and, we would add, the commonly taught languages as well; it should have funds to disperse commensurate to the task being undertaken. Preferably, an existing unit among the federal granting agencies should expand its definition of mission to include this important national objective. Failing this, a separate fund needs to be established. Such federal funds can then join with state-level and private funding to begin to make the necessary transformations. Any one of the above agencies is a natural candidate for this role; as it is, the task falls between the federal stools.

Recommendation:
A federal fund should be created that is specifically charged with the support of research and program development in language pedagogy. This fund can be channeled through existing organizations, but the efforts of these organizations must be coordinated so that a coherent policy serving the national interest can be devised and implemented. Should the current definitions of mission of the existing agencies make this impossible, a new, centrally administered fund must be created.

RECAPITULATION--AN ACTION PLAN FOR LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY

Herewith in summary form is a listing of the principal domains in which we will identify problems and make recommendations. We consider these domains the next steps in the development of our national campus resource base. They are given in the order of their importance in effecting the major transformation, the quantum leap forward, in language instruction that we believe to be essential.

1) Develop a common metric that is language performance-oriented and calibrated for all levels of fluency. Equally important is encouraging the adoption of this common metric on as wide a basis as possible on campuses, throughout the government, and by other employers.

2) Give special emphasis to the achievement of more advanced skills--oral as well as written--than is commonly the case now. This task calls for the establishment of new norms of acceptable language competency in those area studies groups in which they are currently low; for the creation of new pedagogical styles and learning situations that emphasize higher-level skills; and for longer-term fellowship programs that make it possible for students to acquire those skills.

3) Supplement the existing campus-based organizational style for language instruction. This task will include an increased use of intensive year-long, semester, or summer courses in which only language skills are taught; the creation of teaching facilities and materials to deal with language skill maintenance and upgrading for the existing stock of specialists; the development of the capacity to teach students who cannot reside physically at major centers of language instruction or who need to proceed at their own pace; and the creation of learning opportunities for those other than regular students who need to learn a language outside the normal academic format.

4) Create a series of campus-based language teaching resource centers, linked to a central coordinating body. This network will assemble technical resources; conduct basic and applied research; help to prepare and evaluate teaching materials and approaches;

train teachers; administer tests needed for accrediting students and teachers; conduct prototype intensive language instruction programs; and maintain a capacity to provide, on demand, instruction in the least commonly taught languages not available elsewhere. It will also act as liaison between the campus-based efforts and those of the Department of Defense and other government and private language teaching enterprises.

5) Provide the financial resources necessary to conduct sustained research and experimentation in language pedagogy. A special fund should be established either within an existing granting program or as a distinct funding program.

NOTES

[1] John L. D. Clark and Dora E. Johnson, A Survey of Materials Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages in the United States, submitted to U.S. Department of Education Division of Advanced Training and Research, International Education Programs (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1982), pp. 85-97.

[2] John Hart, "Tongue Tied...," The Times Higher Educational Supplement (London), 9 September 1983, p. 9.

[3] Richard I. Brod, ed., "Language Study for the 1980s: Reports of the MLA-ACLS Language Task Forces" (New York: Modern Language Association, 1980).

[4] David Wiley and David Dwyer, comps., "African Language Instruction in the United States: Directions and Priorities" (East Lansing: African Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1980).

[5] For Michael Lofchie's report on the special needs of African studies, see Appendix H, which includes summaries of the special needs of each of the world area study groups.

[6] Clark and Johnson, A Survey of Materials Development Needs, pp. 37, 40, 41-42.

[7] Warren W. Eason, "A Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States" (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, Inc., forthcoming).

[8] Richard D. Lambert et al., "National Target for South Asia Specialists" (New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1981), p. 34.

[9] Lorraine M. McDonnell, with Cathleen Stasz and Rodger Madison, Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients, prepared for the U.S. Department of Education (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983).

[10] Ibid., pp. 67-71.

[11] Ibid., pp. 69-72.

[12] John B. Carroll, The Teaching of French as a Foreign Language in Eight Countries, International Studies in Evaluation, V (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975).

[13] U.S. Government Inter-Agency Language Roundtable, "Inter-Agency Language Roundtable Language Skill Level Definitions: Speaking" (Arlington, VA: U.S. Government Inter-Agency Language Roundtable, 1983), p. 2.

[14] Clark and Johnson, A Survey of Materials Development Needs, p. 26.

[15] Ibid., pp. 26-28.

3
Area Competency

In this chapter, we turn to area competencies, discussing both the components of the training of individual specialists, and the aggregate aspects of our national resource base, relating the flow of new trainees to the stock of existing specialists and to estimates of the supply and demand for specialists. Once again, we will assume the major accomplishments that have occurred to date and concentrate instead on the kinds of changes that might improve language and area studies as the field looks ahead.

AREA TRAINING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

To pick up one thread from the Preamble, the division of training programs between the campus and the Department of Defense (DOD) in the wake of the dismantling of the Army Specialized Training Programs (ASTP) that we observed in language training became even more marked in the imparting of area expertise. In ASTP, the area component of the training of a language and area specialist was the provision of a general body of erudition about the country or region on which the student was to become an expert. This general knowledge included a minimal corpus of information on the geography, society, politics, economy, history, literature, and arts of the country or region. As in the language program, the campus and the DOD systems diverged as they moved in-house in the DOD and into graduate-level M.A.

and Ph.D. programs on the campus.

Unlike language training, which is largely centralized at the Defense Language Institute (DLI), there is no centralized system of area training across the various military services. Indeed, the need for area training and the extensiveness of the training provided varies considerably from one service to another. SRI International reported:

> The Army has the greatest need for area specialists for assignments to intelligence, plans and operations, security assistance, psychological warfare, civil affairs, and unconventional warfare positions. These duties justify a separate secondary specialty, Foreign Area Officer (FAO), in which an individual can spend some 12 years of a 30 year career. Air Force officers, however, are less likely to be involved to such a degree in assignments requiring an area specialty. While they may serve as attaches, political-military specialists, and in other positions requiring area knowledge, these requirements are secondary to other considerations.... The Navy, with its focus on service in the fleet and operations at sea rather than on activities ashore that would require elaborate area and language capabilities, is even less interested in area specialists. Naval intelligence is primarily concerned with enemy naval forces, rather than civil administration or other requirements ashore. Hence, the Navy can concentrate on a few languages and areas and does not feel it requires a formal area expert subspecialty as elaborate as that of the Army.... In contrast, the Marine Corps, with longer overseas shore duty, does feel a need for a limited number of area specialists and has developed a small program....

Army area specialty training involves several related phases, conducted under various auspices. Officers receive basic language training at the Defense Language Institute and six months of specialized area training at the Army's Foreign Area Officer Course at Fort Bragg, N.C. They may also attend high level courses at foreign military staff colleges. Selected officers, perhaps half of the army's area specialists, will be sent to obtain a graduate level degree in a foreign area-related academic discipline. Perhaps as many as 50 or 60 of these are attending fully-funded graduate programs at as many as 40 colleges or universities of their choice that have acceptable area study graduate programs; the specific colleges will vary from year to year and student to student. Another 40 students may be enrolled in a cooperative degree program at Campbell University, N.C., linked to their course work at the FAO course at Ft. Bragg, and another 20-25 in a similar program with Georgetown University tied in with their assignment to the U.S. Army Russian Institute at Garmisch, Germany. Still another three dozen officers, who will be teaching at the U.S. Military Academy in related disciplines, are attending graduate schools under a joint USMA-FAO program.

An elaborate overseas training program usually consists of a year's travel and research in the region of specialization. Some officers may spend two years at the U.S. Army Russian Institute in Garmisch, involving advanced academic study, language training, and travel to Eastern Europe. Others will spend a like period at the British Ministry of Defense Chinese Language School in Hong Kong....

Compared to the Army area specialty training program, that of the Air Force is far less extensive. Air Force personnel selected for such training, if they do not already possess proficiency in the language of the area to be studied, will undergo language training at DLI or, in a few cases, FSI. The overwhelming majority of these officers will then attend appropriate courses at the Naval Post-Graduate School, Monterey, CA. Some officers will be sent under an AFIT-sponsored [Air Force Institute of Technology] program for graduate study at the MA level in Latin American affairs at the University of Texas, Alabama, or Tulane. This year, for the first time, the Air Force is funding a single doctoral candidate, in Southern European affairs, and plans to place two more next year, in Soviet and East European studies. The Air Force also sends one or two officers annually to selected universities for a year of post-BA area training under its "Research Associate" program. Nevertheless, the Air Force definitely prefers to send its selectees to an in-service institution like the Naval Post-Graduate School where it has influence over the curriculum content and where classified materials can be employed. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that Air Force selectees for outside graduate study will be admitted by the desired college or university.

Area studies in the Navy are confined to the Post-Graduate School at Monterey, with language training essentially at the DLI. Naval officers spend either a year or 18 months in the National Security Affairs Program at the Post-Graduate School. where area studies constitute an important portion of the curriculum. Completion of this program--or possession of an equivalent academic degree--entitles an officer to the Country Area/Regional Specialist designator. A handful of officers have attended the Army's area program, but there is no Navy program to send area trainees to civilian academic institutions.

The Marine Corps has a small area training program for four officers annually, one each to be trained in Russian, Spanish, Chinese,

> and Arabic. Following language training at DLI, these officers go abroad for a year's advanced study at the Army Russian Institute at Garmisch, the U.S. Army School of the Americas in Panama, the Singapore National University, or a State Department FSI facility in Tunis. They are also encouraged and generously funded to travel and develop personal relationships. The Marine Corps has no area study advanced degree program at civilian academic institutions in the United States.
>
> The Defense Intelligence Agency, which uses a great number of military and civilian area/language specialists, does not have its own area training program. Military and civilian analysts assigned to or hired by DIA are assumed to have the requisite skills for their jobs. DIA, however, does provide considerable support in the area of skill maintenance.[1]

It is not our role to comment on the adequacy of these area training systems. Presumably, they are evaluated on occasion by area specialists, including people from outside the DOD system. We do want to note several features before passing on to the campus-based area studies training system.

First, area training takes place largely within the DOD and is aimed specifically at DOD personnel, with only the Army regularly sending to the campus a sizable number of students for academic area training. Second, like ASTP, DOD training emphasizes heavily the acquisition of language skills and a general knowledge of the country. Third, given the military's worldwide involvement, the number of area specialists being trained is quite small. Fourth, DOD country coverage is quite limited, leaving to the campus the production of area expertise with respect to a very large portion of the world. Fifth, in its fully elaborated form, DOD area training involves instruction both in the United States and abroad, and in a variety of institutional contexts. Sixth, the intelligence sections of the government that do require a substantial number of area experts and more generalized area expertise, the National Security Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency, tend to hire people already trained on the outside, increasing immensely the DOD's stake in the quality and continuity of training on the campus.

We do not suggest that the area specialist training pattern of the DOD is ideal or suited to the training of academic specialists. The two worlds have and should have different objectives and styles. For one thing, the technical part of DOD training is aimed at military and intelligence needs, while campus-based training is focused primarily on producing research scholars and teachers or other private sector professionals. Nonetheless, the DOD and the academic world do share a generalist component of substantive instruction to produce a high level of expertise in an area. This component might well benefit from an exchange between the two systems of teaching materials and views on what it takes to make an expert. However, without examining the actual content of that portion of the area training, we can deal only with the gross organizational features rather than the substantive core of the training of an area specialist, whether in the DOD or on campus.

AREALITY IN TRAINING

Problem:
Area training has been too heavily concentrated in the disciplinary departments, so that students becoming area specialists cannot develop broad perspectives or professional skills as components of their expertise.

As the successors to the ASTP programs diffused widely throughout American higher education, the area studies side expanded immensely. At the end of World War II, there were only a handful of courses on American campuses that dealt with East European and Third World countries; courses in Latin American and East Asian studies were somewhat more numerous. The number of courses dealing with all non-Western countries has grown to many thousands--91,000 in 1970,[2] and probably considerably more now. With the exception of introductory civilization survey courses, all of these courses are offered within particular disciplines, mainly for undergraduates who take a single area course as part of their general education. The training of specialists has been grafted onto this fragmented structure of classes and faculty dispersed throughout the various disciplines.

This development has meant that the strongest part of the training of an area expert is in the discipline in which he majors. The non-major component of his coursework comprises a smaller and smaller portion of his training, and it too comes in the form of discipline-specific courses. In such circumstances, it becomes more difficult to assure that each area expert will have a minimal corpus of general knowledge of his area.

For a long time, there was a recurring debate on the campus about which would be the better anchor for a student's research and teaching: his area, or his disciplinary interests. This debate was a symptom of the tension between specialized training in a given discipline and the generalist training substantively focused on a world area, which was part of the original ASTP model and which still characterizes much of the government's area specialist training. One rarely hears this debate anymore. The reason is simple: the disciplines won.

Three things have happened: 1) the overwhelming majority of a student's training is bounded by his discipline; 2) leaving aside language training, the specific area component of this training is relatively small, and almost all of it is within the student's major discipline; 3) the amount of generalist training a student gets through taking courses in his area but in other disciplines is quite small. The generalist aspect of language and area studies appears as a vestigial M.A. or certificate program, or as discipline-specific courses that include materials from other disciplines. Nonetheless, these three trends are a good point of departure for our discussion of next steps in the improvement of area studies training.

What is our evidence for these three conclusions? The most extensive and current source of data we have is a tabulation of graduate courses taken by 329 students out of a total of 344 who, at the end of their domestic training, applied in 1983 for Title VI-funded fellowships to carry out their dissertation research abroad in 1984. The results of the tabulations are presented in Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

Table 3.1 shows the number and disciplinary distribution of applicants in 1983 for Title VI dissertation-year fellowships, by world area. The first column of Table 3.2 shows clearly the first trend referred to above: how discipline-bound the graduate training of these fellowship applicants was. On the average, approximately three-quarters (74.88%) of a student's training was within his discipline or major. Put another way, almost 18 (17.78) out of 24 (23.75) courses taken by the average applicant were in his major concentration.

The second question about the pattern of training of area specialists is the extent to which this training is area-focused, as against training in disciplinary topics unrelated to the area. Column 2 of Table 3.2 indicates for students in each discipline the average proportion of all courses--omitting language courses for the non-language major--that was area-specific. Only about one-quarter (25.82%) of a student's training was spent on his specific area, as column 3 shows.

The Rand survey's 1983 analysis of the areality--that is, the degree to which training is focused on a world area--of Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowship graduate training is confined to the proportion of all courses a student took in his major that were related to the area, a somewhat narrower question than the areality of all of his courses, whether in the major or not. The Rand findings reinforce our impression of the low areality in many students' area studies

Table 3.1

Number of Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants by Discipline and World Area

	WORLD AREA								
	AFRICA	EAST ASIA	EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR	LATIN AMERICA	MIDDLE EAST	SOUTH ASIA	SOUTH-EAST ASIA	WESTERN EUROPE	TOTALS
Anthro	15	7	7	38	4	7	20	0	98
Applied	6	4	3	8	4	3	2	1	31
Arts	3	5	5	2	2	2	1	1	21
Economics	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	9
Geography	3	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	9
History	15	8	11	13	7	0	1	4	59
Language Related	6	18	14	6	2	5	1	0	52
PoliSci	7	6	6	6	3	0	2	1	31

Table 3.1 (continued)

Number of Title VI Dissertation Year Applicants by Discipline and World Area

	WORLD AREA								
	AFRICA	EAST ASIA	EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR	LATIN AMERICA	MIDDLE EAST	SOUTH ASIA	SOUTH-EAST ASIA	WESTERN EUROPE	TOTALS
DISCIPLINE									
Rel&Phil	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	12
Socio	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	7
TOTALS	60	56	49	80	25	25	27	7	329

Note: Applied = Education, Engineering, Law, Medicine.
Language related = Language, Linguistics and Literature.

training in many disciplines. Rand reported:

> We can get a sense of the centrality of area studies to various disciplines by looking at the percentage of graduate coursework devoted to world area courses within a respondent's academic major: 45.6% for history majors, 39.7% for area studies majors, and roughly 20.0% to 25.0% for anthropology and political science majors. Economics majors spend only ten percent of their coursework on area courses in economics, and sociology and professional majors spent less than fifteen percent.[3]

A similar impression of the relatively low areality of the training of many specialists is given by the responses of Warren Eason's sample of Soviet and East European specialists. One of the questions asked was, "During your own formal training in a discipline and in Soviet and East European studies, what kind of emphasis was given to an area focus or application to the area within your discipline?" 21.0% of all respondents indicated that the area had received little or no emphasis in their disciplinary major.

The third and, for our purposes, equally important question is how much of a student's training with respect to a world area is confined to his discipline. Column 3 of Table 3.2 applies to this question. These percentages measure the extent to which a student was exposed to the perspectives of other disciplines in the course of his area-specific training. In a discipline-ordered world, this is the functional equivalent of the generalist component of an area specialist's training that was such an important part of the ASTP and now of the DOD training. It is evident from this column of Table 3.2 that the percentages are really quite small--on the average, only 6.42%.

The Rand 1983 data on this topic of the interdisciplinary aspects of the training of FLAS fellowship recipients are equally revealing. Rand reported:

Table 3.2

Analysis of Graduate Coursework of Title VI Dissertation Year Fellowship Applicants, 1983

	CONCENTRATION OF COURSES IN THE MAJOR[b]	AREA SPECIFIC COURSES[a]			TOTALS	
		% OF AREA SPECIFIC COURSES AMONG ALL NON-LANGUAGE COURSES[c]	% OF AREA SPECIFIC COURSES OUTSIDE THE MAJOR AMONG ALL NON-LANGUAGE COURSES[d]	NUMBER OF AREA SPECIFIC COURSES OUTSIDE THE MAJOR	NO. OF APPLICANTS	NO. OF COURSES EXCLUDING LANGUAGE COURSES
	%	%	%	No.	No.	No.
MAJOR DISCIPLINE						
Anthropology	76.97	10.00	6.47	139	98	2150
Applied/Prof	69.64	4.24	4.01	35	31	873
Arts	86.04	28.13	6.46	31	21	480
Economics	65.18	4.02	3.12	7	9	224
Geography	55.43	4.71	3.99	11	9	276
History	80.98	44.29	9.92	119	59	1199
Language Rel[e]	71.68	58.23	13.72	206	52	1501

Political Sci	76.20	14.68	6.18	40	31	647
Religion/Phil	76.76	28.44	11.93	39	12	327
Sociology	62.59	11.51	10.07	14	7	139
Grand Mean	74.88	25.82	6.42	-	-	-
Grand Total	-	-	-	502	329	7816

[a] Area specific courses are those which mention the area in their titles.

[b] The total no. of courses taken by applicants in their major divided by the total no. of courses, excluding language courses, for all but language majors.

[c] The no. of area specific courses divided by the total number of courses, excluding language courses, for all but language majors.

[d] The number of area specific courses which were not in the major divided by the total number of courses, excluding language courses, for all but language majors.

[e] Language Rel = Language, Linguistics, and Literature.

> No world area had students spending more than an average of 20% of their course work on such interdisciplinary courses [outside of their academic discipline]. Economics was the least interdisciplinary, and geography, area studies, the other humanities and history, the most interdisciplinary. There were no significant differences across cohorts, thus strongly suggesting that language and area studies have not become more interdisciplinary over time.[4]

Warren Eason's data on Soviet and East European specialists convey the same impression of the low incidence of multi-disciplinary training with respect to the area. He reported that 36.8% of all his respondents and as many as 50.0% of the economists indicated that they had had little or no interdisciplinary training with respect to their world area. The Rand survey indicated that students training to be Soviet specialists were better on this score than those of other area studies groups.

In short, except for their language training, many area studies specialists are best characterized as subdisciplinary specialists strongest in their disciplinary training, less strong in the disciplinary aspects of their area, and weakest in their knowledge of other aspects of the society. The breadth of substantive knowledge with respect to the area that should mark the "old hand" finds little place in the current training of many students. For students in many majors--particularly those like economics, where the technical component is large--there is even relatively little training on the area per se.

Recommendation:
Area training should include a substantial amount of area-specific work in the discipline in which a student is specializing, plus supplemental area-specific work in other disciplines outside the major, and either classical or modern training, depending on which period complements the primary emphasis.

SPECIAL COST OF TRAINING

Problem:
The need for experience overseas and the breadth and long duration of training mean that students training to become area specialists need more money to complete their training than non-area-oriented students.

Overseas Training

Except perhaps for some students training to be specialists in the classical periods of the great historic civilizations, the student is generally expected to conduct his doctoral dissertation research abroad in the area of his specialization. The Rand survey reported that 65.9% of its Ph.D. sample had collected material for their dissertations in the world area of their specialty. The various area study groups differ somewhat in this respect: 80.8% of the Africanists but only 42.5% of the Soviet specialists had done their dissertation research abroad.[5]

Aside from enhancing the student's technical skill in the conduct of research, this overseas experience is the equivalent of the familiarization period spent abroad in one or another of the DOD area training programs. The opportunities for overseas student fellowships are limited by both financial and other constraints. For instance, the Joint Committee on African Studies of the Social Science Research Council/American Council of Learned Societies indicated to us that in 1983, it had at least twice as many good applicants for dissertation-year fellowships as it had funds to administer. In some other cases, such as the USSR, the limitation is access to the country.

Of at least equal importance to the training of a specialist is the opportunity to study the language of the area in a country where it is spoken. It is difficult to imagine someone making a career as an area specialist without the opportunity to supplement domestic training in a language. Only half of the FLAS graduates have been able to take such language training.[6] This is a function in part of limited availability of organized overseas language training facilities, and in part of limited funding to take advantage of the resources that do exist.

Unfortunately, for most students the opportunities to study or to conduct research in their country of specialization come after their domestic training. Our campus visits and other interviews indicated that a familiarization trip to the field early or midway in the student's specialist training process would have the immensely desirable result of making more tangible the scholarly information that makes up most of his formal education. If this early visit results in an improvement of the student's language competency, so much the better. In any case, considerable experience in the foreign country by a substantial portion of the student body in an advanced area-oriented class would both make the materials more meaningful, and upgrade the level of instruction for the class as a whole.

Length of Training

We commented in the last chapter on the long periods of time students require for a basic mastery of one of the least commonly taught languages, especially the most difficult. On the area studies side, the ideal training we envisaged--a thorough knowledge of one's discipline, both with and without reference to the area, plus a generalist knowledge of the area from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and an overseas sojourn for research and familiarization--will take longer than the training of a student who need only take courses in his discipline without reference to an area, as is the case with most disciplinary majors.

We noted that the full complement of area training is not now the most common training pattern; the interdisciplinary component of area training tends to be truncated at best, and almost all work remains within the discipline. Even in these circumstances, however, students training to become area specialists take more time to finish their Ph.D.'s than the less internationally focused students who major in the same discipline. The evidence of the Rand 1983 survey of FLAS fellowship recipients is that the time taken by FLAS graduates was indeed lengthened by the extra demands of becoming an area specialist.

> On average, respondents took slightly over 8 years to complete their Ph.D.s, although they were officially enrolled in graduate school for only about 5.7 of those years. East Asian specialists spent the longest time in graduate school (8.9 years total, 6.3 years officially enrolled), a significantly longer period than for all other world areas except Western Europe and Southeast Asia. Similarly, historians, anthropologists, and language and literature majors took significantly longer to complete their Ph.D.s than their colleagues in economics.
>
> The time spent in graduate school has steadily increased over cohorts, with the latest two spending significantly more time earning their Ph.D.s than the two earlier cohorts. The 1977-79 cohort spent, on average, almost an entire year more enrolled in graduate school than the 1969-70 cohort.[7]

In short, even with the relatively low level of generalized area training both within and outside the student's major discipline, it now takes a long time to get a Ph.D. with an area specialization.

Fragmentation in Training and Student Support

While the DOD training of a specialist can move to different locales, the components of training for any one of its students are relatively fixed, and the source of support during that training is assured. One of the strongest impressions we received in talking with students on campuses was that exactly the opposite was the case in the training of the academic area specialist. For instance, if a student begins his training to become a specialist at the undergraduate level--and in the case of those studying the most difficult languages, this early instruction is becoming increasingly important--any undergraduate training to become a specialist is financed entirely through his own funds. At the graduate level, he must piece together student loans, teaching assistantships--increasingly scarce commodities--and federal support, usually in the form of a Title VI fellowship awarded and administered by the language and area studies center. Title VI support is, at best, short-lived; it lasts on the average only two years out of the more than five the student must spend in graduate training.

Moreover, in any given year, this funding support is problematic for reasons not related to a student's own talents and accomplishments. For one thing, he must compete with all other students in the program, seeking the approval of professors who are often in substantive areas quite different from his own. Furthermore, the center that allocates the fellowship must constantly weigh using the fellowship to recruit new students against giving it to an advanced student regardless of his accomplishments. The center must also balance the various disciplinary specialties of its faculty. Above all, the fact that these funds are available only through centers for their own students ties each student to a particular center throughout his career, even though one or more of the specialists with whom he should work for part of his training may be located elsewhere.

Finding funds for area graduate training is further complicated by the fact that teaching assistantships are usually made through the disciplinary departments. Traditionally, these assistantships are in the more domestically oriented, large-enrollment courses in each discipline, so that area specialization within the major is more a liability than an asset in terms of the desirable qualifications for an assistantship.

Even more precarious are the quite separate competitions for overseas language study or dissertation research, without which, for occupational purposes in most fields, domestic area training will have been wasted. Most overseas fellowships are awarded in national competitions totally divorced from the student's university context; his domestic training may or may not have prepared him to participate in such national competitions. Finally, there is virtually nothing in the way of that crucial support an area graduate student needs after his return from the field to write up his research and to make the transition into his first job.

We did not meet a single faculty member of a language and area studies center who did not rank student fellowship support as the highest priority, nor did we meet a single student who had not incurred excessive debt in the course of his specialist training. The marvel is that so many of these students persevered in their training despite their dire financial circumstances.

It seems clear to us that the present pattern of graduate student support is dysfunctional for the training of advanced language and area specialists. Support is too limited, too segmented, and inflexible with regard to locale and purpose. We recommend a two-tier system of fellowships, one allocated to centers and the other directly to students through national competitions.

For the first tier, as at present, a quota of fellowships for the early years of training should be allocated to the centers. From the perspective of both students and centers, it is better that the initial fellowships be allocated through centers. Since the largest number of students begin their area specialization at the graduate level, are frequently recruited from among students who come to a university because of the strength of a disciplinary department, and are often recruited as potential specialists after they have begun their training, it is important to have area-specific fellowships available to encourage area specialization. The natural location for the fellowships is a Title VI center. From a student's perspective, this procedure affiliates him with the interdisciplinary strength of the center in the early stages of his training when the breadth of his training is most important and his early language instruction is taking place.

From a national perspective, to ensure that the selection of fellowship candidates reflects a student's promise as a future area specialist, he must have had an opportunity to demonstrate his aptitude in learning a difficult language, his dedication to become an area specialist, and his scholarly ability in his discipline as it applies to the area. Hence, the record of his early performance in language learning and in area-specific training is essential to an effective national selection process. It is during the first years of training under the center-administered fellowship program that this early experience in training to be a specialist takes place.

Once some record of achievement has been established, a series of individual fellowships should be awarded through highly selective national competition. These fellowships should be renewable for a substantial period of time--a minimum of four years--and they should be portable both within the United States and abroad. In order to avoid irreparable harm to students who are not chosen at the early stages of their work, a number of these fellowships should be open each year for shorter periods of time to more advanced students, including those requiring only assistance to conduct their dissertation work abroad.

Recommendation:
The amount of support to graduate students in area studies should reflect the special requirements of their training. It should include sufficient funds for a mid-training sojourn in the area; advanced language training in the country where the language is spoken; a sojourn to carry out dissertation research; a period of time to write up research findings; and post-doctoral research.

Funds for the first two or three years of training should be provided through centers; thereafter, funds should be awarded through national competitions. In the national competitions, language proficiency and general area knowledge will be rewarded. Nationally competitive awards should be portable and should carry with them appropriate institutional fees.

DISCIPLINARY IMBALANCES

Problem:
The disciplinary distribution of specialists and students training to be specialists is skewed. Specialists tend to be underrepresented in the social sciences--especially economics, sociology, and psychology--and in the applied disciplines that may be most directly relevant to public policy. The conditions underlying these imbalances are self-perpetuating.

Under the prevailing laissez-faire system for recruiting and training language and area specialists, the cross-sectional disciplinary complement of specialists, though it varies from one world area to another, remains relatively constant among various studies and over time.

Table 3.3 represents an attempt to relate data from studies conducted in the 1980s to baseline data on the disciplinary distribution of specialists taken from the 1970 Lambert Language and Area Studies Review (LASR). The data collection techniques of the later studies are somewhat varied, and therefore precise comparisons among and between them and the 1970 data are dangerous. Even with this caveat, the rough equivalence in the percentage of specialists in each discipline--and particularly in each group of disciplines over a 10 year period--is striking. Most changes are probably well within the range of error for the various surveys. While there are some variations among area studies groups, they all share a relatively low proportion of economists and sociologists, an almost total absence of psychologists, and very limited representation in the applied and professional fields, such as law. medicine, and engineering.

Despite some largely hortatory priorities estab-

Table 3.3

Disciplinary Distribution of Specialists in 1970 and the 1980's: in East European, Latin American and South Asian Studies

	EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR		LATIN AMERICA		SOUTH ASIA	
	LAMBERT[a] 1970 %	EASON[b] 1981 %	LAMBERT[a] 1970 %	MERKX[c] 1983 %	LAMBERT[a] 1970 %	LAMBERT[d] 1980 %
DISCIPLINE						
Arts	0.8	2.8	0.8	0.8	2.7	11.2
Relig/Phil	0.8	1.7	0.5	-	12.6	8.0
Hist(inc.Arch.)	36.9	28.2	24.1	27.1	20.2	13.9
Literature	20.1	14.9	10.7	15.2	8.3	6.1
Linguistics	2.5	10.4	2.7			
Humanities	61.1	58.0	38.8	43.1	43.8	39.2
Anthropology	1.0	1.9	8.5	7.7	15.0	18.8
Sociology	1.4	2.2	6.3	7.1		
PoliSci	15.6	19.6	13.7	18.1	18.5	12.5
Economics	7.7	7.0	11.3	8.8	8.9	5.8

Geography	3.4	2.5	6.2	2.4	4.1	5.5
Psychology	0.2	0.4	0.3	-	-	-
Social Sci	29.3	33.6	46.3	44.1	46.5	42.6
Education	1.5	0.9	2.7	1.6	2.9	2.8
Science & Tech	2.8	1.3	16.2	4.9	1.5	4.6
Applied/Prof	4.3	2.2	18.9	6.5	4.4	7.4
Area Studies	6.0	4.5	4.4	3.6	-	-
Number of Specialists	2218	1207	2188	1607	980	1932

[a] Richard D. Lambert, Language and Area Studies Review, Monograph 17 (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973), pp. 375-84.

[b] Warren W. Eason, "A Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States" (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, Inc., forthcoming).

[c] Gilbert W. Merkx, "The National Need for Latin American and Caribbean Specialists: Current Resources and Future Requirements" (New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1983), Table III.

[d] Richard D. Lambert et al., "National Target for South Asia Specialists," Table III (New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1981).

lished for the distribution of specialist support under Title VI, this distribution is the result of a laissez-faire recruitment and training system disaggregated into the separate disciplinary tracks. The resulting complement of disciplines is the product of the interplay of three factors: 1) the hospitality of the discipline toward substantive specializations, including area-specific ones--the lack of hospitality or acceptance of area expertise in some disciplines is reflected both in the low prestige of existing faculty with an area specialty, and in a reduced likelihood of replacing such faculty with similarly focused people in the future; 2) the composition of the existing corps of specialists; and 3) the tendency of faculty members to train students to be like themselves.

The combined effect of these factors is the guarantee that the bulk of the specialists, faculty, and students will be in anthropology, history, language and literature, or political science. Not only do these disciplines encompass the majority of area specialists, but the faculty members in these disciplines make up the core of each center. Among specialists in general, members of other disciplines are less likely to spend a large proportion of their professional work on the area or a large proportion of their effort on center activities.

Tables 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6 present data on this point. Table 3.4 presents data from Warren Eason's "A Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies," by discipline, on the percentage of specialists' professional time spent on area-related work. Several things are clear from this table. First, for almost all area specialists, their work on the area is part-time. Only about one-fourth of all specialists who teach do all or almost all of their teaching on the area. The figure is a little higher for research, but even there, only 48.6% of the respondents indicated that they devote all of their research energies to the field of Soviet and East European studies. This impression of area studies as part-time work is reinforced by the Rand finding that only 29.1% of FLAS graduates employed in government gave themselves a 5 on a 1-to-5 scale in terms of utilizing

Table 3.4

Degree of Utilization of Area Expertise (Areality) in Teaching and Research by Soviet and East European Specialists by Discipline

	AREALITY IN TEACHING					AREALITY IN RESEARCH				
	NONE OR ALMOST NONE	1/4	1/2	3/4	ALL OR ALMOST ALL	NONE OR ALMOST NONE	1/4	1/2	3/4	ALL OR ALMOST ALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DISCIPLINE										
Arts	25.0	46.4	17.9	93.6	7.1	7.7	11.5	34.6	26.9	19.2
Philosophy	15.8	47.4	15.8	15.8	5.3	11.8	41.2	17.7	17.7	11.6
Religion	8.3	58.3	8.3	8.3	16.7	12.5	25.0	25.0	12.5	25.0
History	11.5	31.1	23.8	18.5	15.0	8.4	10.5	6.8	14.9	59.5
Literature	8.8	10.7	10.7	8.2	61.6	3.2	11.7	5.8	11.7	67.5
Linguistics	12.5	13.5	10.4	10.4	53.1	15.2	11.4	8.9	6.3	58.3
Anthropology	28.6	50.0	7.1	7.1	7.1	6.2	12.5	18.8	18.8	43.7

Table 3.4 (continued)

Degree of Utilization of Area Expertise (Areality) in Teaching and Research by Soviet and East European Specialists by Discipline

	AREALITY IN TEACHING					AREALITY IN RESEARCH				
	NONE OR ALMOST NONE	1/4	1/2	3/4	ALL OR ALMOST ALL	NONE OR ALMOST NONE	1/4	1/2	3/4	ALL OR ALMOST ALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DISCIPLINE										
Sociology	40.9	40.9	9.1	4.6	4.6	16.0	20.0	16.0	20.0	28.0
PoliSci	6.9	33.3	26.4	12.1	21.2	7.7	15.9	16.4	16.9	43.0
Economics	18.5	53.7	18.5	9.3	0.0	9.1	23.4	15.6	15.6	36.4
Geography	19.4	61.1	16.7	2.8	0.0	13.5	35.1	13.5	18.9	18.9
Psychology	33.3	33.3	-	-	33.3	50.0	-	25.0	-	25.0

Table 3.4 (continued)

Degree of Utilization of Area Expertise (Areality) in Teaching and Research by Soviet and East European Specialists by Discipline

	AREALITY IN TEACHING					AREALITY IN RESEARCH				
	NONE OR ALMOST NONE	1/4	1/2	3/4	ALL OR ALMOST ALL	NONE OR ALMOST NONE	1/4	1/2	3/4	ALL OR ALMOST ALL
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DISCIPLINE										
Education	33.3	66.7	-	-	-	20.0	40.0	30.0	-	10.0
Science & Tech	-	-	-	-	-	46.7	33.3	20.0	-	-
All Disciplines	13.8	30.5	18.3	11.9	25.8	9.4	16.2	11.6	14.2	48.6
Number of Specialists			942					1000		

Source: Eason, "A Dynamic Inventory."

their language and area studies training in their current job. The equivalent percentage for graduates working in the private sector was 41.1%.[8]

The second implication of Table 3.4 is that research activities tend to be more area-focused than teaching. This finding is true for all disciplines, but is especially true for the social science disciplines.

The final implication of the data in Table 3.4 is related to the general point under discussion: the highly area-specific disciplines, both in research and in teaching, are the core disciplines of anthropology, history, language and literature, and political science. In later sections of this report, we will show that it is the scholars in these core disciplines who tend to be most fully committed to a center's activities; it is also in these disciplines that the replacement of a retired area expert by another area expert presents the least problem.

One of the by-products of the varying intellectual hospitality among disciplines toward an area specialization is a varying willingness among disciplinary departments to offer substantive courses that deal specifically with a country or region. Accordingly, these core disciplines are where the majority of area course enrollments are found, especially the undergraduate course enrollments that provide one of the main economic rationales for the provision of an area staff position, particularly a tenure-track one.

Table 3.5 indicates from our survey sample of 39 Title VI centers the undergraduate and graduate enrollments, by discipline, in area-specific courses. This pattern in the existing center course offerings is also reflected in the marketplace of opportunities for college and university teaching.

One further set of data illustrates how marginal language and area studies is to all but the core disciplines. Table 3.6 indicates for the 1983 Title VI dissertation-year fellowship applicants the percentage of all their graduate coursework that was devoted to

Table 3.5

Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollments by Discipline in 33 Title VI Centers (1982)

	AF		EA		EE		IA		LA		ME		SA		SE	
	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.
DISCIPLINE																
Anthropology	114	13	117	11	5	11	-	-	136	54	139	100	25	39	22	30
Area Studies	400	3	532	69	963	171	797	47	109	29	433	91	99	13	111	31
History	504	165	1609	272	1661	336	34	9	414	117	1085	273	188	135	262	40
Language Related	210	144	1579	725	3336	1019	40	64	3570	360	1426	758	141	323	63	116
Political Science	204	61	366	118	804	342	-	-	130	46	742	144	140	29	27	15
Subtotal	1432	386	4203	1195	6769	1879	871	120	4359	606	3825	1366	593	539	485	232
Applied/Prof	4	3	68	102	12	76	-	-	22	69	16	7	-	-	-	-
Archeology	-	-	8	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	41	1	5	-	-
Arts	321	102	575	131	223	76	-	-	80	26	352	27	169	113	91	55
Economics	30	24	81	24	136	60	-	-	70	65	76	25	24	1	-	-
Geography	46	2	-	-	116	27	13	11	13	-	45	16	13	-	51	24

Table 3.5 (continued)

Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollments by Discipline in 33 Title VI Centers (1982)

	AF		EA		EE		IA		LA		ME		SA		SE	
	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.	U.	G.
DISCIPLINE																
Psychology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Relig/Phil	-	-	967	69	-	-	-	-	-	-	800	67	351	121	19	2
Sociology	14	4	141	5	43	16	-	-	13	-	128	34	28	17	-	-
Subtotal	415	135	1840	348	530	255	13	11	198	160	1440	217	586	257	161	84
TOTAL ENROLLMENTS	1847	521	6043	1543	7299	2134	884	131	4557	766	5265	1583	1179	796	646	316
No. of Centers in Sample	4		5		5		1		4		5		6		3	

Note: Several centers usually included in the sample base were excluded here due to the fact that they did not distinguish graduate from undergraduate enrollments. Additionally, in one EE center and one SA center, a total of 494 students in language-related courses were not included for the same reason.

Sample Size = number of centers analyzed out of total number of Title VI centers (1982), by world area: AF-4/10; EA-5/16; EE-5/12; IA-1/1; LA-4/16; ME-5/13; SA-6/8; SE-3/4.

Table 3.6

Concentration of Coursework Devoted
to Language and Area Courses by Title VI
Dissertation Year Fellowship Applicants, 1983.

DISCIPLINE	% COURSEWORK IN LANGUAGE & AREA STUDIES	NUMBER OF APPLICANTS
Anthropology	14.99%	98
Applied/Prof	8.50%	31
Arts	37.95%	21
Economics	9.66%	9
Geography	7.46%	9
History	51.84%	59
Language Related	58.39%	52
Political Science	22.87%	29
Religion/Philosophy	50.09%	12
Sociology	21.47%	7

Note: This list excludes languages not indigenous to each world area, e.g., French was not counted as an African language.

language and area training, by discipline.

What all of these data indicate is that current disciplinary imbalances are likely to continue, and if they change at all, they are likely to get worse. On campus after campus, we found concern about the danger that center-connected specialists in the hard social sciences and the applied and professional disciplines would be replaced upon retirement by disciplinary specialists with no area competency. One dean after another stressed that making appointments that combine disciplinary and area strength, particularly in economics and sociology, was the critical problem for the survival of geographically focused concerns. Several indicated that the normal carrot to departmental chairmen and personnel committees--central or external support for all or part of a position--was no longer enough of an incentive.

As disciplinary departments are forced to shrink in size, or where choices have to be made among future growth trajectories, area specialization tends to rank well down in the pecking order. This finding has important consequences both for the future quality of language and area studies, and for a possible return to parochialism in the disciplines themselves, just when an important part of the action in many disciplines is moving abroad. As we will later note, one of the critical functions of centers is to play the on-campus advocacy role that makes it possible to maintain in less hospitable disciplines these posts for scholars with an area competency.

The difficulty with the present situation is that many of the national interest uses of language and area competencies require a complement of precisely those specialists in the hard social science and professional disciplines who might be considered endangered species. In part, what we will note below as a gap between the national need and the national demand for specialists is a function of the more general problem of the use of liberal arts Ph.D.'s outside of the academic world.

In view of the institutionalized bias against the creation and retention of language and area specialists, we believe that the normal pattern of increasing funding in general--in the expectation that the desired complement of specialists will materialize--will not work. Instead, resources must be directed specifically to pinpointed disciplinary specialties, both to assure the continuation of the existing complement where it is in danger of erosion, and to add to the stock where important new competencies must be created.

Our recommendations for raising the complement of language and area specialists who have both a substantial language and area competency and an applied or professional skill will be divided in two parts, one relating to retaining the current complement of skills, and the other to recruiting and training new specialists.

To maintain the current complement of expertise, we have in mind essentially an academic "cloning" device, tying a small number of long-term fellowships to individual scholars--mentors--in the hope of reproducing their scarce combination of skills. The second recommendation is to broaden the skill range of existing scholars, somewhat on the model of the dual competency training awards given by the International Research and Exchanges Board, in which established scholars with one specialty are encouraged to add a second competency. In the currently contracting job market for academics, the addition of a new skill to those of a scholar already placed within the system has a greater chance of success than the creation of entirely new tracks.

Recommendation:
To assure at least replacement of the present stock of specialists with scarce disciplinary-area skill combinations, a set of apprenticeship fellowships should be put at the disposal of eminent scholars for students wishing to enter these specialties. These mentors should be selected by distinguished national panels. The students in turn would be selected from a national pool of applicants by these mentors. As in the case of the advanced fellowships described in the previous section, these apprentice fellowships would be of four years' duration, flexible, and portable--at the discretion of the mentors--both domestically and abroad, and would carry appropriate institutional fees.

To expand the corps of specialists, established scholars should be enabled to acquire language and area skills or new country competencies, as in the International Research and Exchanges Board dual-competency program. For newly trained specialists within applied or professional disciplinary fields, sufficient resources should be invested to allow for the acquisition of both a fully developed disciplinary or technical skill, and a high degree of language and area competency.

EFFECTIVE DEMAND AND NATIONAL NEED FOR SPECIALISTS

Problem:
Effective demand for area specialists in terms of job opportunities is decreasing, at the same time that the national need for high-quality specialists continues.

In the early days, the perceived national problem was an overall shortage in the number of trained specialists, no matter what their disciplinary or topical specialization. Hence, there was a general emphasis on producing more and more specialists as quickly as possible. This posture fit very comfortably into the customary practice in higher education. In most academic fields, there is no tradition or mechanism for keeping track of and shaping the flow of students, in terms of either their cross-sectional distribution or their numbers. Although there are institutions like Yale that severely limit their intake of graduate students in general, forward manpower planning is not a strong point of much of higher education, except in the professional schools.

Language and area studies have reached a point where manpower planning seems called for. Issues of the match between supply and demand are intruding because the findings of a number of national surveys--like the Rand reports, which have called into question the old assumption of a general scarcity--have shown the increasing difficulty of job placement for graduates of the programs as the general academic job market contracts.

Since language and area studies is, for the near term at least, in a non-expansionary mode within higher education, the size and replacement needs of the current pool of specialists is a critical element. We have no evidence more recent than 1970 of the number of specialists in each of the world areas, although there are some rough estimates for particular fields and purposes. One thing is clear, however: in many areas, disciplines, and topical specializations, the "tiny bands of specialists," as Francis Sutton used to call them, are no longer tiny. A glance at the total number of specialists enumerated in Soviet and East European, South Asian, and Latin American studies given earlier in Table 3.3 indicates this fact.

The trouble with such gross figures is that there is no way of disentangling the fully qualified, high-quality specialists from a larger number of people whose participation in the field is marginal at best. The 1970 LASR indicated that of the 5,618 specialists who responded to the questionnaire, only 924, or 16.5%, were what were called "language and residence qualified specialists."[9] That is, they had resided in the country of their specialization for at least three years; had made two visits, one of them during the preceding five years; and had rated themselves as coping easily with speaking or reading one of the languages of the area.

There has been no parallel enumeration for all world areas since the LASR in 1970. However, an enumeration of South Asia experts in 1980, carried out as part of the National Targets project for the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies (NCFLIS), counted 2,046 individuals called "knowledge producers"--that is, they had written on, held a fellowship with respect to, or given a scholarly paper about the area in the previous five years. These 2,046 compared with an estimated 980 knowledge producer specialists in 1970. Of these 2,046 in 1980, 762, or 37.2%, were judged by panels of their disciplinary peers to be professional specialists in the area. Some 26.6% of the total pool of knowledge producers and 71.4% of those labeled experts by their peers were judged to be language-competent. The number of language-competent experts was estimated at 544. But even this number of specialists is not a "tiny band." The number of East Asian, Soviet, and Latin American specialists would be considerably greater, and the proportion who have some language competency probably higher.[10]

The picture on the demand side is even more murky. One problem is that two very different notions of demand are used--one "effective" demand, and the other what can be called "national need." Effective demand consists of employment opportunities based upon 1) replacement formulae, as in the report on international studies for the Ford Foundation by Barber and Ilchman;[11] 2) statements about possible hiring estimates from likely employers in the government or business, as in the 1979 Rand study for the Presidential Commission;[12] or 3) the employment experience of program graduates, as in the 1983 Rand survey of FLAS graduates.[13]

This most recent Rand survey considers two aspects of the issue: employment rates, and the utilization of language and area studies training on the job. With regard to the former issue, the Rand survey reported an unemployment rate of 4.8% among a 10-year cohort of FLAS alumni Ph.D.'s. of those interested in and actively seeking employment. The unemployment rate for those not completing the Ph.D. was slightly lower.

Whether one judges this Ph.D. unemployment rate as high or low depends on whether one is in that 4.8%, and, in aggregate terms, what one compares this unemployment rate with. The general national unemployment rate has been hovering around 10%. The unemployment rate for all professional and technical workers in January 1982 was 2.9%, but this figure includes doctors, engineers, and others with bright prospects in the job market. A more comparable group were humanist Ph.D.'s who had earned their degrees between 1975 and 1980. 2.5% of them were unemployed as of February 1981, with higher rates of 3.2% for modern language and literature majors and 3.1% for history majors, two fields very heavily represented among language and area studies students.

There are two especially troublesome aspects of the 1983 Rand data. First, the unemployment rate increased with the recency of the graduation. For the most recently graduated cohort, those graduating in 1977 to 1979, the rate was as high as 7.9%. The second disturbing aspect was the kinds of jobs graduates found and the extent to which they utilized their language or area training in those jobs. Table 3.7, reproduced from the Rand report, presents an overall picture of job placement and utilization based upon a theoretical 100 FLAS fellowship holders.

Projecting from the figures in Table 3.7, it seems that 60% of the FLAS fellowship holders will go on to complete the Ph.D.; sixty-five percent of these Ph.D.-holding FLAS recipients will go into academic work, of whom two-thirds will use their language and area training all or most of the time. Of the non-Ph.D.'s, 77.5% will be employed in jobs outside of the academic world, and even among those who become academics, less than half (44%) will use their language and area skills. Among those going into non-academic jobs, only 43% of the Ph.D.'s and 29% of the non-Ph.D.'s will use their language and area studies training.

Rand goes on to report that among those in non-academic jobs, it is more likely to be their language than their area competency that is utilized on the job. Looked at another way, the Rand figures are saying that an academic job with a high utilization of language and area training is likely to be available to only 30% of the students, and that only 48% of the program graduates will be in any kind of job that allows reasonably full utilization of their training. We have no comparable data for people in the various non-area-oriented aspects of the relevant disciplines, but these utilization rates for language and area studies, even more than the overall unemployment rate, pose a genuine challenge to the field.

The second concept in the discussion of the demand side of the supply-and-demand equation is not job openings or employment histories, but national need. The reports of the National Targets project produced for the NCFLIS in 1981 illustrate this approach. The authors of these reports note that effective demand is a poor guide to national policy--indeed, it is part of the problem. The fact that we prefer to fill overseas State Department, armed services, and business posts with people who have neither competency in a language of the area nor familiarity with its culture and traditions does reflect

Table 3.7

Ph.D. Completion and Skill Utilization Patterns For A Hypothetical Group of FLAS Recipients

Of 100 Recipients:
  44 will earn a Ph.D. within approximately 8 years, and
  16 will earn one several years later.

Of the 60 Ph.D.s:
  39 will become academics, of whom
    26 will use their FLAS expertise all or most of the time, and 13 will not.

  21 will take nonacademic jobs, on which
    9 will use their FLAS expertise all or most of the time, and 12 will not.

Of the 40 non-Ph.D.s:
  9 will work in academic institutions, where
  4 will use their FLAS expertise all or most of the time, and 5 will not.

  31 will take nonacademic jobs, on which
    9 will use their FLAS expertise all or most of the time, and 22 will not.

Note: These projections are based on the data, presented in Chaps. 1, 2, and 5, [of McDonnell *et al.*, *FLAS Fellowship Recipients*] on Ph.D. completion rates and the distribution of academic and nonacademic jobs among Ph.D.s. and non-Ph.D.s. Skill utilization estimates are based on the proportion of various respondent types (i.e., Ph.D. versus non-Ph.D., academic vs. nonacademic job) who scored their language or area studies usage as either a 4 or a 5 on a 5-point scale.

[McDonnell *et al.*] are making a conservative estimate here and assuming that the proportion of FLAS Ph.D.s taking nonacademic jobs will grow at about half the rate that it did during the past decade.

Source: Table 3.7 is taken from McDonnell *et al.*, *FLAS Fellowship Recipients*, p. 126 (See Notes, p.142).

low demand--but one can only add, alas. Once one leaves the relatively well-charted waters of immediate demand to go to estimates of national need, it becomes difficult to get reasonable bearings. In any event, the numbers of specialists "needed" in such exercises tend to be considerably higher than the estimates for short-term effective demand. Table 3.8 reproduces the numbers of needed area specialists from the National Targets reports.

Undoubtedly, the national interest lies somewhere in between the two extremes presented in Table 3.8. For the sake of the students facing the immediate job market, surely the current situation calls for some contraction of the total flow, particularly for those heading for the academic market. In fact, the market seems to be making such an adjustment already. The number of degrees granted in language and area studies specialties has been declining in recent years in certain world area study groups, such as Soviet and East European, Middle Eastern, South Asian, and Inner Asian studies, as shown in Table 3.9. Moreover, the number of Title VI fellowships awarded each year has never recovered from the cuts in 1973, as demonstrated in Table 3.10.

We were unable to get systematic data on the current application and intake rates at the various centers, but the general impression we received was that in view of tales about the difficult job market--as in almost all of the social sciences and in all of the humanities--the number of students entering the training process has slowed down considerably.

In making recommendations about whether deliberate control at the intake point is in order, it would be helpful to know just how many students are in the pipeline now, where they are in their training, and what the attrition rate is for various kinds of students in the course of their training. Rand's figure of 40% who stop at the M.A. level indicates a kind of attrition, but it misses those who dropped out of the field entirely without completing any degree, and includes many who never had any intention of proceeding to the Ph.D.

Table 3.8

Estimates of National Needs for Specialists from National Targets Project, 1981

	PRESENT MANPOWER CAPABILITIES	NEEDS FOR SPECIALISTS
WORLD AREA		
Western Europe	1,347	1,487
Canada, Australia, and New Zealand	110	200
Africa	523	3,793
South Asia	542	1,230
Middle East	751	3,922
Oceania	28	40
Southeast Asia	950	1,500
East Asia	1,100-1,200	2,200-2,400
Soviet Union & Eastern Europe	1,296	2,030
TOTAL	6,647-6,747	16,402-16,602[a]

Note: The Latin American panel of the National Targets Project did not report capabilities and needs for specialists in their area.

Source: Allen H. Kassof, ed., "Report of the Task Force on National Manpower Targets for Advanced Research on Foreign Areas" (New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1981).

Table 3.9

Degrees Awarded By Title VI Centers Over Time

	AVERAGE PER ONE ACADEMIC YEAR BETWEEN 1959-1971[a]			ACADEMIC YEAR 1975-1976			AVERAGE PER ONE ACADEMIC YEAR BETWEEN 1979-1981[a]		
	BA	MA	PhD	BA	MA	PhD	BA	MA	PhD
DISCIPLINE									
AF	197	128	38	519	261	102	1187	289	115
Asia Gen	234	130	30	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asia & EE	10	8	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Canada	-	-	-	30	3	3	200	13	3
EA	354	109	34	1489	272	120	1353	423	172
EE	582	245	76	970	208	100	1390	190	74
IA	3	6	2	9	6	4	14	4	2
Int St[b]	-	-	-	39	197	15	1574	231	104
LA	1263	422	153	1774	349	117	2228	375	140
ME	174	63	37	691	189	80	469	179	48
Pac Is	-	-	-	23	54	9	41	19	5
SA	58	50	27	152	68	45	115	43	37
SA & SE	104	43	17	-	-	-	-	-	-
SE	4	16	8	38	50	26	89	185	19
WE	17	5	2	125	68	22	880	136	82
TOTALS	3000	1225	425	5852	1725	653	9518	2088	803
GR TOTALS	4650			8230			12410		

[a] rounded to nearest whole person.

[b] includes General and Comparative Studies.

Table 3.10

Number of Title VI Fellowships by Year and World Area

	YEAR										
	FY71	FY72	FY73	FY74	FY75	FY76	FY77	FY78	FY79	FY80	FY81
WORLD AREA											
Africa	74	214	115	85	84	95	93	91	98	89/18-S	95/31-S
East Asia	193	481	329	247	202	201	195	195	194	188	180/56-S
Eastern Europe	130	261	165	123	125	140	138	131	142	137/41-S	134/50-S
Inner Asia	-	-	-	-	8	10	8	10	11	10/2-S	10/3-S
International Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15/2-S
Latin America	121	169	115	84	54	74	85	79	89	84/17	81/22
Middle East	125	265	177	132	137	146	140	142	143	146/34	142/41-S
South Asia	75	184	116	88	90	97	97	98	102	92/22-S	93/29-S
Southeast Asia	41	181	71	53	63	79	73	76	72	69/14	67/24-S
Western Europe	10	25	22	15	0	0	3	6	7	8	11

S = Summer instituted programs in FY 1980

Note: The 1972 figures are representative of pre-1970 levels. The 1971 figures are lower owing to decreased funding in that year. The decline after 1972 represents cutbacks in the Title VI programs.

We also need some indication of the loss of specialists from the existing pool as well as the process of lateral recruitment--that is, people becoming specialists after their student days. In particular areas, like African and South Asian studies, where the language skill demands for entry into the field are low, scholars can still enter the field without a long training period. It is our impression, however, that the field itself has raised its standards as to what makes an expert, and therefore lateral entry has slowed appreciably. It is also our impression, particularly in the fields with low language skill demands and where professional or applied disciplines are relatively well represented, that a great deal of attrition is taking place.

The juxtaposition of effective demand versus national need allows us to address another side of the issue. Clearly, in the immediate post-Sputnik era, the problem was the pressing national need for specialists, primarily in the Soviet field. It was assumed that if the national need was so great, the effective demand would be there for trained language and area specialists. In fact, in the two most likely markets for these skills, this was not the case. Out of 2,231 students who had held fellowships in Rand's 10-year sample, only 186 were hired into business firms and 165 into positions with the federal government.

Businesses in particular have been slow to attribute any value to a prospective American employee's competency in the language or culture of one of the countries where businesses operate. The Rand report and others indicate that as yet, the utilization of language and area studies skills among those employed in business is even lower than in government. Businesses prefer to deal through intermediaries in that country or to hire nationals who have graduated from American business or engineering schools. For Americans, a language or area competency ranks way down on the scale of considerations for employment, well below the business and technical skills. Indeed, businesses sometimes see a language or area skill as a limiting factor, fearing that an employee anchored to one locale will be unable to move freely laterally and vertically throughout the firm, and that he may favor the interests of a particular region over those of the company as a whole.

It is odd that business has not yet recognized another aspect of language and area studies that could be a rare asset. Students training to be language and area specialists are self-recruited by an eagerness to work and live in the countries they study, and, unlike the early or mid-career technicians whom the companies often send out for overseas assignments, language and area specialists not only welcome long overseas sojourns, but have learned to participate in those societies at levels few management people could hope to achieve. It would probably be easier to graft a little business or technical training onto the truly scarce skill, a long-term overseas residence orientation, than the other way around. The technical business skills, however, must be real skills. Dilettantish business skills are no more useful than a thin veneer of language and area training.

The creation of a satisfactory role in business for an American specializing in the languages and culture of a particular area is most likely to develop with respect to Japan, Latin America, and one or more of the countries of Western Europe. The few students already launched on these career tracks should be watched with interest. Surely it is in order to translate our general rhetoric about the national need for an internationally trained business management class into an effective demand for those trained in international skills.

As is the case in business, the gap between a perceived national need and effective demand in government is great. The SRI International report forcefully documents this curious dichotomy. On the one hand, there is a general perception that our military intelligence operations would be better informed by having available the broader contextual knowledge that is the hallmark of language and area studies. On the other hand, at the operational level, there is little felt need for people with these skills. Even language skills for intelligence purposes are of so special a character--and there is a widespread belief that university-trained specialists do not have a high enough competency level in any case--that there is little desire to import language and area specialists from the outside.

The State Department's links are more substantial and durable. However, even here the entry-level application form does not have a question on academically acquired competency in language and area studies. The equivalent of language and area specialists within the State Department as well as in the military--those who remain for long periods of time working on the same country or world area--often have limited upward mobility and eventual rank. And more generally, James R. Ruchti in his report to the Presidential Commission found that, except for Soviet specialists, only one out of three language and area specialists employed by the federal government indicated that they were using that competency in their work. The proportion was one out of two for Soviet specialists, but one out of six for Africanists.[14]

Clearly, the first step in making demand come closer to national need is to try to improve the utilization of language and area studies skills in obvious areas of national need. Tied to this point is the need to supplement the training of language and area specialists with skills that will make them more attractive for non-academic employment. At a minimum, this means a major improvement in the level and occupational utility of their language competency. It also means grafting on occupational skills more attuned to that job market, not necessarily instead of their current training, but in many cases on top of it. It should be kept clearly in mind, however, that for most students, the academic world is the primary job market. Indeed, in the early days of Title VI, a willingness to teach was a requirement for receipt of a fellowship.

As indicated above, a carefully worked out national manpower policy with respect to language and area studies would call for the accumulation of more precise data on the supply side. It should also include a major effort to increase demand where the national interest would be served by introducing more language and area expertise among business and government employees. In addition, too great a dependence on current market projections should be avoided. Our national experience a few years ago with the presumed glut of engineers indicated just how inexact a science forward manpower planning for trained professionals is.

Nevertheless, it would appear that, in the short run, some limitation on intake or some reduction in the number of students receiving federal support is called for. There is some support for this position in the field itself. Several of the questions in Warren Eason's inventory of Soviet and East European specialists asked the respondents to estimate the present, past, and future market for specialists. The distribution of responses is given in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11

Market Demand Estimates By Soviet and East European Specialists

	Market Now %		Market Past %		Market Future %
Excellent	1.4	Better	9.7	Improve	27.7
Good	7.9	Same	35.8	No Change	55.4
Fair	32.4	Worse	54.5	Worsen	16.9
Poor	53.4				
Non-existent	4.9				

Source: Eason, "A Dynamic Inventory."

Most respondents judged the 1981 market demand for specialists to be poor. In their view, things had been bad for some time, and only about one-fourth thought that things were going to improve. In view of this situation, relatively few (13.3%) of Eason's respondents thought that the number of students admitted to centers for training to become a Soviet or East European expert should be increased. The remainder of the respondents were about equally divided between holding admissions at a constant level (46.3%) and decreasing them (40.4%). In view of the traditionally expansionary perspective of the field, the proportion of respondents who called for limiting the number of new entrants into the field is impressive.

We have no equivalent data on other area studies groups. Our general impression is that the current job market demand for particular kinds of language and area skills--for instance, economists training to be Japanese, Soviet, or West European specialists--still exceeds the supply, but there are no data to confirm these impressions.

Recommendation:
The number of fellowships for new entrants into the field should be reduced and made highly selective. The savings from this reduction, plus any additional resources necessary, should be used for the establishment of the proposed nationally competitive, longer-term, portable, flexible fellowship, and for the fellowships specially earmarked for missing or endangered components in the national resource base.

A pressing agenda for the field is to explore ways to bring national need and effective demand into closer agreement.

NOTES

[1] SRI International, "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe," prepared for the Association of American Universities (Arlington, VA: SRI International, 1983), pp. 28-30.

[2] Richard D. Lambert, Language and Area Studies Review, Monograph 17 (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973), p. 1.

[3] Lorraine M. McDonnell, with Cathleen Stasz and Rodger Madison, Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients, prepared for the U.S. Department of Education (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983), pp. 23, 26.

[4] Ibid., p. 26.

[5] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

[6] Ibid., pp. 64-65.

[7] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[8] These percentages were provided by Lorraine M. McDonnell, and taken from the data used to compile McDonnell et al., FLAS Fellowship Recipients.

[9] Lambert, LASR, p. 54.

[10] Richard D. Lambert et al., "National Target for South Asia Specialists" (New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1981), p. 34.

[11] Elinor G. Barber and Warren Ilchman, "International Studies Review" (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1979).

[12] Sue E. Berryman, Paul F. Langer, John Pincus, and Richard H. Solomon. Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy, prepared for the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1979).

[13] McDonnell et al., FLAS Fellowship Recipients.

[14] James R. Ruchti, "The U.S. Government Employment of Foreign Area and International Studies Specialists," Background Papers and Studies [Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U. S. Capability] (Washington, DC: The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. 1979), p. 190.

4
Research

While the pattern of national funding for language and area studies and the rationale that justified it have been almost exclusively concerned with the training of specialists. it is the knowledge that these specialists create and the extent to which it is shared with and utilized by the society that is of the greatest long-term interest. Accordingly, it is surprising that so little has been done to examine 1) the nature of the research enterprise on the campus; 2) the corpus of published information produced by the specialists; 3) the pattern of support for that research; 4) the limitations on American scholars' access to research sites abroad; and 5) the extent to which the research product of language and area studies is useful to, and is used by, various segments of the society outside the academic world, such as business and those areas of the government with a responsibility for international affairs.

The statistical data and the impressions of the site visits make abundantly evident the extent to which the first four of these--scholarly perspectives. research coverage, research support, and research access--are interactive, and all in turn determine what is available for use by the society. These data also make clear both the advantages and the imperfections of the current laissez-faire system of language and area studies research, and the need for a way to survey our collective research product, possibly an external overview, to ensure that the collective profile does not leave uncovered research domains of highest national importance.

We mean by this not only issues of relevance to national public policy, but topics crucial to the basic understanding of other societies that might not otherwise be discussed. A principal finding of this section of the survey is that the interrelationship among faculty perspectives on research, research funding, and research administration, and patterns of use by government and private organizations has resulted in a skewed profile of research output that only partly serves the national interest. It seems clear that without some significant modification of the administration of research funds, the situation we observed will persist and even intensify.

Before we begin, several more general comments must be made. First, the collective research product of the faculty of the language and area studies programs comprises an impressive corpus of knowledge. The amount of information and insight on other parts of the world that has been created by American scholars since World War II has been remarkable. There is no other country of the world that can come close to matching it. This corpus of knowledge has contributed to the immense growth in our national level of sophistication about the rest of the world, both in the educated public and in the formation of our national policy. Its composite scope and focus are therefore of genuine national interest.

Second, a caveat. Particularly in the domain of research and publications, it is dangerous to characterize the work of all language and area specialists without speaking specifically of the particular world area with which they are dealing. The focus and the collective profile of research in Latin American studies is different from that in East European studies, which in turn is quite different from research in African or East Asian studies. Indeed, the nature of the research product in West European studies has little in common with what takes place in research on the Third World. Those who conduct research on West European countries tend not to see themselves as language and area specialists, and they treat their research as an extension of their disciplinary interests. As an example of this, courses or texts on comparative economic systems usually focus on Europe and the United States, and they are a standard item in many curricula, whereas the economics of developing countries is much more likely to be viewed as a separate field, even though it too deals with comparative economic systems.

Moreover, the key elements of most area studies research--a special language competency; expertise on an area with which few others are familiar; and an emphasis on the unique features of the region rather than its theoretical, methodological, or universal properties--are not so characteristic of West European studies. These are a key difference in terms of the availability of National Science Foundation funding, as we shall see. Because of these important differences by world area, when we analyze the character of the research product of language and area studies, we are at pains to differentiate the work with respect to one world area or another--indeed, one country or another.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS

While time constraints did not allow us to conduct an exhaustive analysis of these matters, we were able to assemble enough data to outline the current situation and to indicate where concerted effort is needed to make the research product serve more fully the national interest. In a nutshell, what we found was:

1. Limited research aims. Collectively and individually, campus-based language and area specialists are directed more toward teaching than research, and insofar as they are involved in research, it tends to be small-scale and individualistic.

2. Clustering by region and topic. Certain countries, disciplines, and topics are relatively well covered, but others are not. Among the latter are topical areas and approaches of special interest to the mission-oriented agencies, including the Department of

Defense. The countries and the topics that are sparsely covered by research include many that are currently or likely to become of high national interest.

3. Underutilization of policy-relevant research. Among non-academic international affairs specialists in the public and private sectors, the utilization of the published results of language and area studies research is less than optimal.

4. Inadequate patterns of funding. The disciplinary and topical imbalance of the research product of language and area specialists is matched by imperfections in the amount and character of research support available through private foundations or public granting agencies. Moreover, research support for language and area studies largely means funds for individual scholars to travel and live abroad for purposes of data collection.

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESEARCH

Problem:
Research aims on the campus are too limited. Scholars do not expect to be able to obtain funding for large-scale, collaborative, multi-year projects; they therefore tend not to think of their own research in these terms and do not pursue funding beyond that necessary to cover their own salary and possible travel costs.

Particularly in the social science disciplines, but also in humanistic work, research projects can play an especially important role when they are substantial enough in scale to involve a number of researchers, to stretch over a number of years, and to include funds to apprentice students in the research process. In our campus visits, we found surprisingly little of this kind of research project among language and area studies faculty, and no strong feeling that this represented a major deficiency of the field. Rather, the pursuit of research support was seen, both at the faculty and the student level. as applying for individual fellowships, particularly fellowships that support trips overseas to collect data or consult materials. Research in language and area studies tends to be a solitary rather than a collective enterprise, and, as we will note below, this has major implications for the substantive focus of much of the research that is carried out.

Interviews with individual faculty members indicated that part of the problem was the diminishing availability over the past several decades of both private and public research funding for substantial research projects by language and area specialists, a point we will return to later. Moreover, Title VI--the principal source of external funds for language and area centers--provides no support for large-scale, collective research through the centers. Title VI does have a modest program of support of small-scale projects dealing with language or program evaluation, and it provides some field research fellowships for individual faculty members and students. The scale and duration of these grants serve to reinforce the current tendency.

In short, the limited availability of funds, coupled with the substantive research focus of many Title VI faculty members in the more historically oriented humanities, has made them think small when they develop their research plans.

In search of a constructive way to change this situation, pointed questions were posed during the campus interviews as to how best to stimulate both more individual and more collective research among center faculty. The overwhelming preference among individual faculty members was for research funds administered through national organizations, with selection through national competition. However, some did stress the need for a modest local source of funds for the early stages of development of substantial, longer-term, collaborative research. It soon became apparent that within the institution, the most effective leverage points for initiating and sustaining an expanded research effort were quite varied from one campus to another.

One thing that was clear, however, was that with few exceptions, organized language and area centers presently play almost no role in the sponsorship of research. Moreover, we encountered very little evidence of multiple-person research, and even less of multidisciplinary research, despite the presence in the same administrative unit of scholars dealing with the same world area but from a wide variety of disciplines. In this vein, it is also interesting to note that of the 39 Title VI centers that responded to the recent Rockefeller Foundation survey of international relations research organizations, only 11 even mentioned research project support as having any place on their funding wish list.

We believe that an attempt should be made to change this situation. We agree with the individual scholars that national research competitions subject to peer group review are the preferable form of large-scale funding for research. We do believe, however, that in order to change the current fragmented research tendencies in the field, on an experimental basis, a modest amount of seed money to promote collective research should be added to the general funds provided to the centers.

Recommendation:
To encourage the development of the larger-scale, longer-term research that would draw in a number of faculty members and help to train students, Title VI should be amended to include a small research fund for each center to cover the early phases of major project generation, and support for students to gain experience in research apprenticeships. In addition, more funding for larger-scale research should be made available and more faculty members should be apprised of the strategy of applying for and administering major grants.

ACADEMIC COVERAGE OF THE RESEARCH PRODUCT

Problem:
Left to the unconstrained preferences of scholars,

research coverage--in either geographic or disciplinary terms or both--has important gaps.

In all areas of research, there is a perpetual tension between two approaches. The first is to let the researchers go wherever their theories and data may take them; the second is to try to influence the directions in which researchers go. The consequence of excessive emphasis on either approach is damaging. Too much freedom for the researchers leaves larger national interests unprotected, while too much constraint undermines the quality of the research and may stifle it altogether.

What applies to research in general obviously applies to area-related research. One objective in examining the state of this research has been to find out in what ways, and to what extent, guidance in the direction of research may be desirable. We have sought to identify major lacunae in country or topical coverage in domains of high, or potentially high, national interest, and to consider the best ways of shifting the stream of research in the direction of those gaps.

Language and area studies research, like most research in the humanities and social sciences, is a mosaic of many different research initiatives, with little, if any, deliberate attempt to shape its composition or to fill in gaps. In the past decades, in fact, language and area studies research has proceeded with very little substantive constraint. Appendix F presents the results of this laissez-faire approach to research. It comprises analyses of the articles and books published by members of the faculty of the Title VI centers (72 out of 76 centers were included in the sample), during the years 1976-81. In all, 5,952 area-related publications of faculty listed in the 1982 applications for Title VI funding by language and area studies centers were coded for country and topical focus. as well as for their policy relevance.

What the Sample Represents

We are proposing to use the publications of the center faculty as a roughly representative sample of the topical and country expertise among the general corps of academic language and area specialists.

This calls for a little clarification. We do not mean by this all people publishing on a particular world area, but only those who do so over a substantial period of time, and with some special area expertise. The larger group is represented in the annual bibliographies of publications relating to particular world areas published by the various area studies associations. For our purposes, however, the enumeration in these bibliographies is too extensive. They tend to include publications by people outside the academic world or by foreign scholars; doctoral dissertations, many written by temporarily resident foreign students; and occasional publications, often of a comparative nature, by American scholars, particularly in the quantitatively and theoretically oriented disciplines such as psychology and economics. Our concern, however, is with the work of scholars resident in the United States who over a long period of time commit themselves to sustained work on an area, usually bringing to it a general knowledge of the area and, if possible, a command of one of its languages.

Is the faculty attached to the Title VI centers representative of that group? It obviously is not coterminous with all qualified specialists. The roster of center faculty overestimates the pool of true language and area experts, in that centers often report faculty as members of the program when their link with the center is quite insubstantial; and it also underestimates the pool, because it omits the fully developed specialists who are at institutions other than those supported by Title VI. For the present purposes, the crucial question is how distorted the cross-sectional picture of the research product of language and area specialists is, if we use only center faculty in our tabulations. Would the picture of the disciplinary, topical, and country coverage of the research product of long-term language and area experts differ if we had a list of all such experts, not just those at centers?

The only attempt of which we are aware to sort out the various levels of expertise and types of contributors to knowledge is the survey of South Asia specialists.[1] That survey counted all U.S.-resident academic knowledge producers in South Asian studies for the same period of time covered in the present survey (1976-81). This was done by enumerating all who had written a book or article, delivered a scholarly paper, received a research fellowship, or written a doctoral dissertation, omitting foreign students who returned to their homeland. Then, through an extensive peer group evaluation of this list, the survey identified those considered to be specialists in the area, and the subset who were competent in one or more of the languages of the area.

For the present survey, we classified by discipline the topical coverage of all area-relevant publications of members of the faculty of Title VI programs in South Asian studies. Table 4.1 shows the relationships among the three forms of enumeration: 1) all knowledge producers; 2) the subset of this group judged to be experts by their peers; and 3) the distribution of area-relevant publications of the Title VI South Asia center faculty.

What do the data in Table 4.1 show? The disciplinary profiles of the three columns are remarkably similar, except that economists and specialists in the applied and professional disciplines are slightly more numerous in the total pool of knowledge producers (column 1) than among experts (columns 2 and 3). This distinction would have been even more striking had we added the column from the original Lambert "National Target for South Asia Specialists" enumeration that displayed the disciplinary distribution of those who were judged to have a language competency. In the previous chapter, we commented on the scarcity of members of these disciplines in the pool of language and area studies experts. Hence, it is not surprising to see their representation diminish as the degree of long-term area commitment and language competency increases.

Table 4.1

Disciplinary Distribution of All Knowledge Producers, Experts, and Title VI Center Faculty Publications, in South Asian Studies, 1976-81

	KNOWLEDGE PRODUCERS %	EXPERTS %	FACULTY PUBLICATIONS %
DISCIPLINE			
Anthropology/Sociology	19.9	16.8	18.9
Art	10.6	12.5	15.7
Economics	5.5	4.7	4.8
Geography	5.2	6.4	1.3
History	13.1	10.6	14.6
Language/Linguistics	5.8	6.6	11.3
Literature	6.0	5.2	17.9
Religion/Philosophy	13.2	19.6	32.5
Political Science	11.8	13.5	12.8
Communications	0.8	0.0	0.7
Education	2.6	0.4	0.7
Library/Bibliography	1.9	3.3	2.6
Science/Technology	3.5	0.4	0.0
NUMBER OF PEOPLE AND PUBLICATIONS	2046	762	459

Source: The first two columns are taken from Richard D. Lambert et al., "National Target for South Asia Specialists."

However, since they represent a small minority of all specialists in any event, these marginal changes do not affect very much the overall distribution of disciplines.

For the purposes of our current analysis, we are particularly interested in the match between the two final columns: the peer-recognized experts, and the Title VI faculty publications. These two columns match quite closely. This has two important implications for the present analysis. First, the disciplinary, topical, and country distribution of the publications of Title VI center faculty can be taken as a fairly representative sample of the general pool of experts. although we would be more comfortable in this assertion if an exercise similar to the South Asian studies one had been conducted for other world areas. Second, any national program that aims to encourage research by language and area specialists should not be limited to the Title VI centers. Important individuals, particularly in the disciplines such as economics, psychology, and the applied and professional disciplines. will be missed. However, we will not be far off if we use the cross-sectional profile of publications of the Title VI faculty, information that is collected every year as part of the center application process, as a guide to general trends in the distribution of the research product of specialists by topic and country coverage.

With this general caveat in mind about the representativeness of the sample and its implications for policy, let us examine the overall composition of the product of language and area specialists by world area, topic, and by country.

The Enumeration Process

First, a few technical notes about the tabulation of publications are in order. For one thing. we omitted all publications of center faculty that had no apparent reference to the area. There is nothing that requires a language and area specialist to confine all of his scholarly work to the area. Indeed, 1,313 or 18.07% of all publications listed for center faculty between 1976 and 1981 had no apparent connection with the world area in which the center claimed those faculty members to be expert. This reinforces the point we made in the last chapter that for most language and area specialists, their work on the area is part-time.

Table F.12 in Appendix F displays the style of analysis represented in most of the tables in this appendix. It is an enumeration of books and articles published between 1976 and 1981 for each country or region in a given world area, in this case Africa. While most of the publications analyzed were articles rather than books, no weighting system was used, so that each publication is counted as a single work regardless of whether it is a book or an article.

However, with respect to country or topical coverage, it was possible for a single publication to fall into more than one category; that is, a book or an article could deal with both anthropology and history, or with both Peru and Chile. Where the number of publications is added across categories, as in Table F.1, this inflates the number. Nonetheless, it does indicate the number of publications whose titles cover each country or topic. Similar double counting has not been done in the tables dealing with policy relevance, since a publication can fall in only one category on this dimension. Hence, in the tabulations on policy relevance, the total number of works analyzed is the same as the total number of works listed in the body of the table.

It should also be remembered that in most of the tables in Appendix F, except where indicated, the count is of the number of publications and not of individuals; an author may have several publications on the same country, and each of them will appear separately in the enumeration.

In the next-to-last column of those tables labeled "Distribution of Publications by Discipline and Country," (e.g., F.12, F.16) we have counted not publications but individual scholars; that is, for each country we have counted an author only once, no matter how many books or articles he has written on that topic. This is the number of faculty members in Title VI-supported language and area programs who have written a book or an article on each country over the past five years.

Country Coverage

It is obvious, from both the number of books and articles and the number of faculty members writing on particular countries, that in each world area there is a concentration of interest on a few countries within that region. In a laissez-faire research market, it is impossible to avoid such bunching. For the humanists, for instance, the centers of great historic civilizations such as India, China, or Japan are of much greater intrinsic interest and hence receive more scholarly attention than, say Bangladesh, Pakistan, or Taiwan. For the political scientists, major actors on the international scene or innovative or pathological political systems attract research, and the sheer size of the country counts as a factor.

However, it does not seem optimal to have so few people working on, for instance, Central America, the Caribbean Islands, Chad, or Lebanon, which are currently of high national interest. It is possible that now that these regions or countries are in the news, a flood of research will follow, as it did in the case of Iran or Nicaragua, but there seems to be a time lag of several years after a country has risen to international prominence before the basic scholarly research dealing with that country begins to appear. Federal research support would seem to be called for--not displacing funds from fruitful work in some of the countries now receiving the bulk of the attention, but specially targeted on the least well-covered countries.

Disciplinary Coverage

Table 4.2 presents an analysis of the disciplinary complement of the publications in the various world area groups. It should be remembered, however, that the enumeration in this table is by the topic of the article or book, and not necessarily by the discipline of the author. One of the strengths of language and area studies is that there is a great deal of discipline crossing in the topics of a scholar's research; for example, a topic that an anthropologist might write about in an area studies context might be covered by an

Table 4.2

Percentage of Publications of Center Faculty by Discipline and by World Area, 1976-81

WORLD AREA

	AFRICA	EAST ASIA	EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR	INNER ASIA	LATIN AMERICA	MIDDLE EAST	SOUTH-EAST ASIA	SOUTH ASIA	WESTERN EUROPE	GRAND MEAN
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DISCIPLINE										
Anth/Soc	20.6	11.0	10.2	13.8	28.6	2.36	27.8	19.0	10.6	20.6
Art	5.7	7.9	3.0	0.0	5.2	12.9	7.3	15.7	7.6	6.9
Economics	18.4	11.7	12.5	0.0	17.7	7.0	12.1	4.8	6.2	13.9
Geography	3.3	1.0	1.8	3.4	4.0	0.9	6.8	1.3	1.1	2.7
History	11.6	20.0	17.0	13.8	11.4	13.2	10.2	14.6	23.0	11.6
Lang/Ling	12.0	13.0	12.6	44.8	3.4	15.3	22.0	11.3	9.0	11.3
Literature	6.6	14.8	24.2	6.9	17.6	16.4	2.0	17.9	32.6	13.7
Phil/Relig	3.4	7.7	4.1	10.3	2.0	20.4	7.8	32.5	5.6	8.3
PoliSci	20.3	13.5	21.1	3.4	14.6	2.81	19.5	12.9	15.7	13.7
Applied/ Professional	10.9	10.9	6.9	0.0	14.1	8.9	5.4	5.2	4.5	15.3
NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS	640	1089	678	29	1334	874	205	459	356	-

economist if it related to American society, or vice versa. Hence, scholars writing on a topic normally identified with a particular discipline may in fact be drawn from a variety of other disciplines.

As was evident in the 1970 Lambert report, the core disciplines are anthropology/sociology,[2] history, language and linguistics, literature, and political science; 20.6%, 11.6%, 11.3%, and 13.7%, respectively, of all publications fall in these disciplines, or some 57.2% in all.

Within this overall picture, however, there are some striking differences in the disciplinary profiles of the various area groups. Studies in history and literature comprise a large part (17.0% and 24.2% respectively) of the publications in Russian and East European studies. With respect to those regions that have great non-Western historic civilizations--the Middle East, South Asia, and, to a lesser extent, East Asia--religion and philosophy capture a large portion of the scholarly attention. The disciplinary profile in Latin American studies is tilted toward the behavioral sciences and the applied disciplines. Publications in Inner Asian studies are concentrated in just three disciplines: history (13.8%), philosophy and religion (10.3%), and language, linguistics, and literature (51.7%).

The reason for this disciplinary spread is not hard to find. It reflects the distribution of the faculty of the programs, and, as we noted in the discussion of that faculty, that in turn reflects the nature of each discipline, especially its hospitality to substantively focused work as opposed to methodologically or theoretically oriented work. It also reflects the composition of the teaching programs, particularly the student enrollments in general education courses dealing with the area. Faculty members write on what they teach, and, with the possible exceptions of education and public health, they tend not to teach courses in professional and applied fields that are focused on one area or world region. There are also region-specific reasons for some of the imbalances. For instance, lack of direct access to the USSR and, until recently, the People's Republic of China has discouraged the social scientists; the lack of written materials in Africa has discouraged historians to a considerable extent and attracted anthropologists; and the recent emergence of new nations in Africa is of some interest to political scientists.

Especially worthy of note, although this varies somewhat among world areas, is the small representation of publications in fields that on the one hand demand a high degree of technical competency, and on the other disparage site-specific expertise. Among the social sciences, this includes economics and, though this enumeration does not make the distinction, quantitatively oriented sociology rather than anthropology. It includes all of the applied and professional fields. As we noted in our examination of center faculty, where there are faculty members in the applied and professional disciplines, they tend to be on the margins of the centers, outside the primary core of those who spend most of their time on center activities. Where one does find representatives of the quantitatively and theoretically oriented social sciences and of the applied and professional disciplines, their familiarity with the country and especially its languages is less firmly grounded than that of the scholars in the core disciplines of anthropology, history, language and literature, and political science. As we noted earlier, this, of course, is a preference of the discipline as well as of the individual scholar.

From the national interest perspective, what is especially troublesome is the paucity of publications by scholars in the applied and professional fields. As we discovered in the analysis of the faculty of the centers, language and area studies is still a liberal arts enterprise. In most of the applied fields, the emphasis tends to be on technical skills that are presumably universal, and in such disciplines there is an intellectual bias against concentrating on a particular world region or country.

This is even true in universities where a school of agriculture or of education has a long-standing contractual relationship with another country, and where many of the members of the faculty return to that country again and again. While many of the faculty members in applied disciplines get to know a great deal about a particular country through field experience, neither their own university nor their own approach to teaching and research is organized in terms of a country or an area expertise, and their language competency, except perhaps for Latin America, remains minimal. Even the Agency for International Development (AID), which has a specific program of long-term university partnerships to build up a cadre of experienced faculty on particular campuses, does not encourage the development of a set of faculty members with a combination of applied skills and language and area competency. AID seems to value their technical and not their country expertise. The research profile of the center faculty dramatizes once again the problem we noted in the centers and student section--the uncomfortable fit of a technical skill with a language and area competency.

What is true of the applied and technical fields is true, to a somewhat less but still considerable extent, of the quantitative and theoretically oriented social sciences. There are some publications in psychology on different parts of the world, but they are relatively few, and those conducting such research tend not to be affiliated with language and area centers. Within the other social sciences, with the possible exception of economics in Soviet and West European studies, the bulk of the area-focused research is on the less quantitative, more descriptive, softer side of the discipline.

An interesting case in point are the publications on economic topics by the faculty of the centers. Since economic aspects of most of the societies in the Third World are too important for the centers to ignore, a not unreasonable 13.9% of the publications were devoted to topics that are clearly economic. However, in many world areas, it was often not the economists who were writing these books and articles. Moreover, even the economists who wrote as area specialists tended not to be econometricians, but were economic historians, development economists, or specialists in "institutional" economics--not the top-ranking divisions of the field.

However much one might argue that the approach of the softer, more humanistic side of the social science disciplines is more suited to the needs of language and area studies, this preference when displayed among economists places them firmly in the second rung of the pecking order within their disciplines. As we will note below, this fact has important consequences for the kinds of federal government research support that are available to the field.

Country and Discipline

The skewed disciplinary spread of publications of language and area studies program faculty is even more marked when one looks at the publications on individual countries. The enumeration of publications by country and by discipline is given at the beginning of each world area section of Appendix F. It is clear that the anthropologists tend to serve as point men for the American scholarly presence in a country. Where there are only one or two publications on a country, they tend to be by an anthropologist or a linguist, followed by a political scientist. Disciplinary spread in coverage is confined almost entirely to the "primate countries" in a region--that is, those that receive the greatest amount of scholarly attention overall.

Sub-Disciplinary Topics

Not only is there a tendency among the scholars in the program to concentrate their research on a few countries and on a few disciplines; scholars also tend to focus on a limited set of topical areas within the disciplines they do cover. A table is given for each world area in Appendix F showing the distribution of books and articles in selected topical domains separated into the major sub-categories by which these disciplines define their specialty fields. These data are presented mainly so that the world area study groups themselves may judge where the substantive gaps in their collective coverage are, rather than as a guide to public policy.

Filling in the Gaps

We are well aware of the dilemmas and the past failure of efforts to control and redirect the research output of scholars. Language and area studies research, like all basic research, moves crablike--a little sideways and a little forward. We are not recommending a moratorium on publications of Russian historians or literature specialists. Their work is immensely valuable in promoting our understanding of the societies they study. However, unless a special effort is made to encourage research that 25 years of laissez-faire operation have shown is not likely to be generated on its own, a tabulation equivalent to the present one will be made 10 or 20 years from now.

And in addition to questions of country, disciplinary, and topical spread, a number of scholars outside the language and area studies community noted that there is a long-term trend toward a narrower definition of researchable problems. However, even though such critics see themselves as closer to the mainstream of the discipline where intellectual progress is being made, the agendas set by academic disciplines, where the work on the frontiers of knowledge is often defined by theoretical concerns rather than a full descriptive coverage of particular substantive domains, are not likely to lead to the kind of comprehensive substantive coverage that the national interest demands of language and area studies. There are durable issues and substantive domains vitally important for our basic understanding of other societies or to inform our public policy--for example, the nature of economic planning in East European countries, or the development of industrial infrastructure or consumer cultures in Third World countries--that current disciplinary research preferences are not likely to reach.

What seems to be called for is a frequent look, such as this one, at the cross-sectional research product of language and area specialists, identifying important lacunae in terms of both short-term knowledge about particular problems or aspects of other societies, and topical areas that will probably be important to the national interest in the long run. Funding should be made available to supplement the current research product with high-quality work on these areas and topics. We would not urge that these topical definitions be very narrow or set to the short-run policy needs of mission-oriented agencies, but be essentially sub-disciplinary areas within which scholars will find breathing room to define topics in their own fashion.

The process of monitoring, identifying important gaps, and encouraging high-quality research on these topics is a difficult one. We recognize that there is little in the funding tradition of most foundations or federal research granting agencies that operates in this fashion. If it is to be accomplished in language and area studies, an organizational structure must be created with the capacity both to monitor the quality and distribution of the research, and to allocate resources based on those findings. We will have some comments to make on such a mechanism later in the report.

Recommendation:
An organization or organizations should be identified and a procedure established to monitor the cross-sectional research product of language and area studies; to identify countries and topics that the laissez-faire selection of research topics has missed; and to disperse and administer funds to fill in those gaps.

POLICY RELEVANCE AND UTILIZATION OF THE RESEARCH PRODUCT

Problem:
There are important substantive domains and types of research with a direct relevance to national policy decisions that are not getting enough attention from language and area specialists, nor are federal agencies disposed to use the research that is produced.

From the perspective of the Department of Defense (DOD) and several of the other mission-oriented agencies, there is a special interest in that portion of the research product directed to policy issues. We recognize, of course, that no strict definition of policy relevance is sustainable. When medieval religious philosophies play themselves out on the national stage in Iran, or when ethnic conflict going back to before the birth of Christ puts a country into chaos as in Sri Lanka, or when in Japan the traditional image of a dutiful girl is being played on television and has become a major political force, it is impossible to declare broad cultural studies as irrelevant to policy.

Moreover, like most academic research and certainly like that carried out by arts and science faculties, language and area studies research is aimed at the creation of basic knowledge. It should not promise what it cannot deliver. Kenneth Prewitt's comments in the Annual Report of the Social Science Research Council are worth quoting in this respect:

> [T]hose of us who find ourselves brokering the relations between university scholars and the federal government would do well to recall the lessons of the 1960s. Put bluntly, federal agencies which did not get what they think they paid for have long memories. This is so even if what they paid for was not what the people being paid thought they were supposed to produce. Great care must be taken in justifying the federal investment in area studies and international scholarship, so that legislators voting the appropriations or bureaucrats writing the contracts have no reason to expect other than what can be delivered--a contribution to general policy formulations by resting them on a deeper understanding of the modern world, how it came to be, its intrinsic limitations and possibilities, and its probable development.[3]

We are especially fearful of too-narrow agenda setting by an outside body that starts with a policy and wants it documented, or by an administrative bureau seeking technical information to carry out policy decisions already made. Language and area studies involves primarily basic research, providing a general understanding of other societies or at most a context in which policy must be cast. Only rarely is basic research focused on a specific problem with findings aimed at direct policy utilization. We do not mean to belittle such research, or to underestimate its usefulness, or to deny that a great deal of even short-term policy making with respect to other countries would be improved if it were informed by a fuller understanding of the social and cultural context of current events; we wish only to comment that by topic and approach, language and area studies tends to be several steps removed from the policy process.

Having said all of this, however, it is surely possible to designate some matters as more immediately relevant to the day-to-day policy tasks facing our internationally oriented government agencies, and to ask to what extent the research product of academic language and area specialists addresses these topics.

To answer this question, first of all, we did a separate tabulation of those books and articles that seemed to have a direct policy relevance, using that term in three different senses. First, we counted all articles and books on social and economic topics that we judged would be relevant to the formulation of current U.S. policy toward a region or country. The second category comprised publications on military and political topics that would be similarly relevant in those domains. The third category covered articles and books that dealt specifically with U.S. policy toward a region or country. Table 4.3 presents the results of this tabulation.

First of all, it should be noted that only a small minority (16.1%) of the publications have direct policy relevance according to any of the three definitions of that term. Second, the bulk of those that are directly relevant to policy deal with internal economic or social development (522 out of 954, or 54.7%). Third, omitting West European and Inner Asian studies, where the numbers

Table 4.3

Policy-Relevant Publications of Center Faculty
by World Area, 1976-81

	POLICY RELEVANCE			
WORLD AREA	ECONOMIC, SOCIAL POLICY	POLITICAL, MILITARY POLICY	DIRECTLY INVOLVING U.S. POLICY	NUMBER OF ALL PUBLICATIONS
AF	83	31	5	666
EA	124	90	27	1108
EE	82	64	9	745
IA	2	0	0	36
LA	100	70	17	1699
ME	64	55	14	1023
SA	38	25	3	402
SE	23	13	6	225
WE	6	3	0	24
TOTAL	522	351	81	5928

are too small to be meaningful, the percentage of all publications devoted to directly policy-relevant matters varies from 21.7% for East Asian studies to 11.0% for Latin American studies. That Latin American studies should have so low a proportion compared to the other area studies groups is surprising.

We found that publications on foreign policy constitute a rather small fraction of the center faculties' scholarly output. Of the roughly 998 publications on political science, only 135 (around 13.5%) were on foreign policy, broadly defined. This figure bears out the conclusion of a recent Rockefeller Foundation survey: we have very few language and area specialists--

in that survey, specifically Soviet specialists--who are informed about the foreign policies of the countries they study, particularly the relationships of those countries with the United States. By default, our foreign policy discourse tends to take place outside of the language and area studies community.

Another way of looking at the matter is to identify two potential clienteles and to look at the sub-disciplinary topics that might be of direct interest to them. Presumably, businessmen might be interested most directly in the economies of particular countries, but they would be especially interested in microeconomic data, particularly those dealing with markets and industry and with international trade. Table 4.4 indicates for each of those topical domains the number of books and articles published between 1976 and 1981 by the faculty of the centers we analyzed. The obvious gaps are in studies of markets and in industrial economics--the topics most likely to be of use to American firms seeking or making investments in these countries.

Similarly, of all the topics in political science--aside from general analyses of the political climate for business such as those involved in risk analysis--the topic most germane to day-to-day business decisions is the analysis of the administrative apparatus of the government. There were only 47 books and articles on this topic relating to any country.

There is no reason why a large number of American scholars should be working to promote the success of particular American companies overseas, but as the new Part B of Title VI recognizes, it is in the national interest to facilitate American businesses' ability to accommodate to foreign environments. Moreover, there might be more job opportunities for graduates of the language and area studies programs if there were some record of faculty publications on basic research of interest to business. Unfortunately, the present guidelines for the business-related aspects of Title VI (Part B) are not now geared to the promotion of such research. One relatively simple step is to include business-

Table 4.4

Publications by Center Faculty on Selected Topics in Economics, 1976-81

TOPIC	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS	% OF ALL PUBLICATIONS ON ECONOMICS
General	148	14.9
Agricultural/Rural	249	25.2
International	168	17.0
Industrial	63	6.4
Economic Development	187	18.9
Planning/Policy	143	14.5
Markets	87	8.8
TOTAL	987	105.7

Note: Publications could be coded as being about two topics. Of the 987 publications on economics, 58 were coded as being about two subdisciplines within economics. This double coding of publications accounts for the total percent adding up to more than 100%.

focused research by language and area specialists in the mandate of this provision of the act. On the side of business, it would be worth trying a series of experiments bringing language and area studies expertise to bear on broad issues of interest to business. This might well create a durable research and consultation capacity on the campuses, but would also be a training ground for students who might want to develop a competency in both worlds.

One further illustration concerns the DOD. Of all the articles published, only 50 had to do with military aspects of other countries. There is no reason to expect the campus to be especially interested in military affairs, and not many scholars have the technical expertise to make a genuine contribution, but it is nonetheless surprising how low the interest is. For instance, we know of only one American scholar who is interested in military affairs in South Asia, and he is not on the faculty of a Title VI center.

These topical choices are perhaps much too specific, but they illustrate the general point that big domains of high policy relevance do not loom large in the publication record of language and area specialists.

The current distance of much of language and area studies research from immediate policy issues is reflected in what we suspect is a low direct utilization rate of the publications of language and area specialists in many of the federal agencies dealing with other parts of the world. We know of no study of the utilization by federal mission-oriented agency staff of materials produced by specialists in the language and area studies centers. We believe it is high time that such a survey be carried out.

Our general impression is that the utilization of materials produced by language and area specialists occurs segmentally in agencies with specific missions such as Commerce, Transportation, and Agriculture. It is probably highest in the Department of State, where general foreign policy toward other countries is generated, but a few interviews with policy makers in that department suggest that even there the press of time, the immediacy of the issues being faced, and the flood of very current materials--such as the daily summaries of foreign broadcasts, press digests, intra-agency field reports, and electronic intercept data--relegate the more general academic publications to nonexistent spare time.

The SRI survey of language and area studies capacities and their links with academic institutions within the DOD intelligence community presents dramatic evidence of the limited day-to-day utilization of materials on other parts of the world produced by academics. The immediacy and high technical content of most DOD intelligence requirements tend to push academic research, like much broad contextual information, onto tomorrow's agenda, and make the regular introduction of contextual materials, particularly those not specifically related to the task at hand, quite difficult. When they are utilized at all, it is at a higher staff level. One of the recurring problems is the gap this situation tends to create between long-term policy makers and day-to-day practitioners, increasing the likelihood of serious errors in policy formulation and implementation of the kind referred to in Admiral Inman's statement quoted in the Preamble.[4]

Where should this contextual, policy-relevant research take place? It is unlikely that the academic setting is the proper place for most of the highly focused, immediate research needed for intelligence analysis. Most of this is and will continue to be conducted in-house. The remainder, with a little longer lead time and a little broader perspective, tends to be carried out on contract with external proprietary research organizations such as the Rand Corporation, SRI International, and the Heritage Foundation. This too seems a satisfactory arrangement, but an incomplete one.

The research domain that is currently not well served is where the contextual and the technical requirements of policy-relevant research are about equally balanced, where the knowledge required of the researcher comprises a competency in the language of the area or a deeper understanding of its politics and society. Here the current system of research contracting and information intake is less satisfactory; this is where the language and area specialists have unique talents to bring to the issue.

For one thing, the proprietary contract research organizations cannot hope to maintain a staff with a depth of knowledge about very many countries, particularly knowledge based upon a command of the language of those countries, and even more particularly on topics other than security analysis and foreign affairs. Recognizing and attempting to rectify just this gap, Rand has recently inaugurated an imaginative program to link their skills to the academic resources at UCLA.

But the university-based language and area specialists are a vital ingredient in this process. Thus, some reasonable percentage of university-based area research scholars could work on topics, selected by themselves and funded by the government, that hold promise for informing ongoing policy discussions. Examples of such topics range widely, from the history of social movements in Poland to the sources of migration in sub-Saharan Africa, from language policy in India to studies of Chinese science and technology. The challenge is to channel some of the language and area studies expertise into an analysis of such problems, while maintaining the vitality, integrity, and independence of the basic research process.

However, we believe that it is healthy and in the national interest that the bulk of the publications of academic language and area specialists should continue to fall heavily on the long-term, contextual side, and to the extent that they are utilized in intelligence, enter into policy formation in an indirect fashion. As the SRI International report noted:

> Within the broad area of indirect support of the intelligence community provided by academic/scholarly institutions and individuals, one of the most obvious sources is the continuing publication of books, journals and special studies and monographs in the general category of area studies. These publications--historical, sociological, cultural, political, geographic, and so forth--serve as the broad basis and background for analysts preparing for more specific, classified studies. While the tendency is for analysts to focus on current, more general periodicals--such as Foreign Affairs or Far Eastern Economic Review--or on technical publications, they do read some university-based periodicals, and scholarly books and journals

> are used for deeper research where time and analytical requirements permit or demand them....
>
> [I]t is evident that many DOD area specialists are aware of the value of scholarly publications, that they are familiar with publications in their field, and that, in varying degrees, they find them useful as general or specific background sources. In many instances, of course, such materials have only limited application to current intelligence requirements, or time constraints preclude their extensive utilization. By the same token, many area specialists are restricted in their reading of such materials to spare moments, or off-duty hours, because of their heavy workload of current materials. But there seems to be a consensus among specialists interviewed that there will be a continuing need for high-quality scholarly publications of this sort, that in an ideal world specialists would have time to make greater use of such publications, and that extensive foreign area study programs and publications provide a sound basis for the development of area specialists and for their indirect support in DOD.[5]

In a sense, this view of the utilization of language and area research underestimates the way in which it already serves to enlighten policy decisions. Although government officials will not always be aware of it, they are frequently consuming the results of basic area research when they read the current periodical literature. That is, the pages of Foreign Affairs or Foreign Policy are very often summaries and translations of a much larger corpus of scholarly work.

Equally important in this connection is the overlap of the academic community and government officialdom in the literally hundreds of seminars and discussion groups organized by such institutions as the Council of Foreign Relations, the Heritage Foundation, and the Brookings

Institution. These structures function as transmission belts, bringing the results of basic scholarship, even if not always so labeled, into the consciousness of officials, even if not always recognized as such. The same point could be made for business where, as we noted in the Preamble, a host of intermediary organizations providing information on other countries depend for that information on the knowledge accumulated by language and area specialists.

Recommendation:
The organization(s) given responsibility for monitoring and supplementing the general substantive coverage of research by language and area studies specialists should be charged with special attention to and funding for policy-relevant research. This research, while remaining basic or contextual in nature, will address some of the broad policy issues facing the nation. In the meantime, Part B of Title VI should be extended to include basic research relevant to the general policy interests of American business abroad.

FUNDING AGENCY COVERAGE OF RESEARCH

Problem:
The narrowly focused missions of the various government research funding agencies are responsible, in part, for the imbalances and lacunae in the research product.

There is a clear interaction between the direction and nature of research and the resources provided to carry out that research. That is not to say that all research is equally influenced by available funds; in the humanities in particular, a portion of the investment in research is the time devoted by individual scholars. But certain kinds of research are dependent on funding, especially those that carry unusual costs, such as the expense of an overseas sojourn, or the facilities and labor force required to carry out research on a scale typical of the hard science end of the social and applied sciences.

The lack of such funds not only diminishes the amount of research that is carried out, but it shapes the aggregate profile of that research. For instance, it tends to limit research to the analysis of data available in the United States; it emphasizes the solitary research of the single scholar rather than cooperative research by a number of interacting scholars; it tends to narrow the scope of the research, or it leads scholars to produce unsubstantiated generalities; and it tends to focus that research on exclusively scholarly concerns rather than those that might also interest public or business policy makers.

First, however, several very general trends in the nature of funds available for language and area studies research must be noted, in particular several interlocking trends that accompanied the shift from the private foundations to the federal government as primary funders of foreign area research. It is not that the foundations moved out of the support of international research entirely--although they did tend to shift to organizational rather than project funding--but by and large they lost interest in funding research on topical agendas generated by scholars and shifted to topics consonant with their own program interests. At the same time, the foundation-generated agendas for research on other countries tended to focus on development issues, paralleling AID's interests, or on national security, a topic on which the language and area specialists have had little to say.

A recent example of this situation is the decision by the Rockefeller Foundation to encourage research on Soviet foreign policy. It did so through providing programmatic funds to create two research centers, rather than by funding project research on this topic more broadly. The recent round of Ford, Mellon, and Hewlett grants are also primarily directed toward general programmatic support. There are a number of area-specific private foundations that provide research support, such as the Japan Foundation, the Scandinavian-American Foundation, the German Marshall Fund, and the Tinker Foundation. The latter foundation, in particular, has been quite helpful in promoting research in

Latin American studies, but it tends to give fellowship monies to institutions or regranting organizations. Such grants tend to be small and of short duration rather than large enough to underwrite the costs of substantial projects for a considerable period of time.

In short, by the late 1960s, the private foundations had ceased being places where scholars went with requests for support for research where the appeal was based upon intrinsic intellectual interest. What monies were spent for this purpose tended to be retailed in small portions to individual scholars or students through intermediary granting organizations like the Joint Committees of the Social Science Research Council/American Council of Learned Societies; the International Research and Exchanges Board; the Foreign Area Fellowship Program; the American Institute of Indian Studies; and through the various area studies associations.

From the late 1960s onward, the search for monies in support of substantive research by language and area specialists had shifted to the research granting agencies of the U.S. government, especially the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Department of Education, the Smithsonian Institution, the Fulbright program, the National Science Foundation, the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, and, to a lesser extent, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration/National Institute of Mental Health, and the Department of State.

As a result of the transfer of responsibility for funding research in language and area studies from the private foundations to the federal government, the research product of that field has come to reflect the cross-sectional definitions of mission of the relevant federal agencies. What does not fit the definitions of one or another agency at a particular time tends not to get funded, and without anyone planning it, the cross-section of research shifts accordingly. This lack of fit--which varies to some extent by region--means, as indicated above, a decline in the resources available for certain kinds of research; a shift to the humanities and away from social science research; the increasing dominance of individual fellowships over project research; and the dependency of substantial portions of the research enterprise on the availability of surplus currencies. An examination of the funding policies of a number of agencies will make clear that some kinds of research have nowhere to go.

The Fulbright program has had a varying relationship to language and area studies research, depending upon the time period being covered and the country. A tabulation of the number of research and other grants awarded under the Fulbright program is given in Appendix G. Many members of the older generation of scholars had their early experience in the countries on which they became expert under the aegis of the Fulbright program.

However, the program's concentration on first visits as a sort of first cosmopolitanizing experience overseas discouraged the repeated visits required by the long-term research styles of language and area specialists. Moreover, in some countries and for a fairly lengthy interval, the Fulbright program, with its binational structure, shifted its program exclusively to the support of lecturers, largely in technical subjects, and other technical-assistance types of selection criteria, although this tendency has been reversed in recent years. While in the past several years, even multiple-person grants have gradually begun to reappear, the technical-aid and teaching aspects of Fulbright continue to play a role and to subtract from the overseas opportunities for research by area specialists. The Fulbright exchange programs make less of a contribution to fundamental area scholarship than many people familiar only with the magnitude of the program have presumed.

For a number of years, the Department of State, through its Office of External Research, has provided funds for research and conferences on topics germane to language and area specialists. This program, at the level of $600,000 to $800,000 per year, is supported by both State Department and other agency monies, and is used to fund conferences, although some original research on primarily foreign-policy-relevant topics is also supported. The State Department has developed an imaginative and smoothly working program for a three-year research partnership between individual academics chosen in a national competition and a State Department professional, to bring the two viewpoints together on a common problem. This durable individual linkage pattern is one with considerable potential for liaison between academic and policy perspectives.

The National Science Foundation (NSF), where one might have expected the social science aspect of language and area studies to have found a major research funding source, has not turned out to be a frequent source of such support. The reason for the lack of NSF funding says a great deal about both the intellectual orientation of language and area studies, and the current research frontiers in the social science disciplines. The foundation does fund a good deal of research on other countries in its social science division. Out of $24.269 million allocated for research projects by that division in 1978, $4.597 million or 18.9% was given for research on topics relating to other countries. In 1980, it was $6.716 million out of a total of $26.446 million or 25.4%. However, a great deal of that research funding went to studies of European countries, 58.2% in 1978, 67.1% in 1979, and 67.5% in 1980.

The most interesting figures, however, relate to the recipients of the grants given by the NSF for research on the countries outside Western Europe. In all three years, 1978, 1979, and 1980, the proportion of those grants going to scholars who were members of language and area studies programs was less than 10%; to put it another way, language and area studies program faculty received about 5% of the total awards for research dealing with other countries, and less than 1% of all social science awards. The total allocation of NSF project funds to the social science faculty of language and area studies faculty in 1980 was $338,493.

The reason for this interesting situation essentially lies in the NSF's view of its mission. It specifies that funding will be given for projects that have a high theoretical, methodological content--this usually means the analysis must be highly quantitative--and are on the universally applicable problems of the discipline. Not only is the NSF's sense of its mission defined this way, but its selection of personnel for project screening committees reflects the same perspective. In contrast, the nature of the research process among many language and area studies social scientists is non-quantitative and ideographic. The NSF is just not viewed by them as a hospitable place to send research projects.

Moreover, our detailed analyses of the composition of NSF screening panels over the years indicate that very few scholars with language and area studies competencies find a place on those panels. Even the international division of the NSF, which might have been considered a natural source of funds for social science research on other countries, is primarily interested in promoting transnational science rather than the study of other countries, although it does draw upon surplus currencies to fund a portion of the social science fellowships of the American Institute of Indian Studies. In short, the NSF is a hard science enterprise, and language and area studies is not; they have surprisingly little to do with each other.

The humanities in language and area studies have fared better under the aegis of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Indeed, that organization has picked up some of the soft social science end of the disciplinary spectrum in language and area studies. The NEH too, however, tends to fund mainly Europe-oriented projects in its research division and deals heavily with pre-modern language and literature. What is missing--and this is largely a reflection of the field itself and not NEH preferences--is a substantial amount of work on what might be called the contemporary humanities; that is, the current trends in cultural and literary development, not just those relating to high points of civilizations in the past.

Moreover, the tendency of language and area scholars to think in terms of individual fellowships rather than substantial, multi-year projects that may involve several faculty members and can be used to train graduate students is even more marked in the humanities than in the social sciences. To alter the current situation in order to add a substantial body of research on contemporary humanistic trends and to increase the scale of some of the projects, a deliberate, earmarked research competition would have to be developed; the normal process of selecting topics from among those proposed by individual scholars and staffing screening committees with prestigious scholars reflecting the substantive biases of the field will merely reproduce the same cross-sectional profile we have now.

Of special interest is the relationship of the NEH to research on language. In the main, to receive language-oriented NEH funding, research must either be on literature, involve a philological or linguistic feature of a language, or be a translation. It cannot deal with language pedagogy. This is a pity, since language pedagogy is what a large number of humanists do for a living on the campus, and the NEH is the natural home for the support of basic research in this area.

Title VI funds in the Department of Education were appropriated for research as part of the center allocation only for a year or two, and that was over a decade ago. The Department of Education does support research of students who conduct dissertation research abroad and provides a limited number of faculty research awards. It also maintains a grant of about $1 million per year in support of the development of teaching materials, testing, and other pedagogical facilities relating to the uncommonly taught languages, and some exploratory and evaluative work on area and international studies pedagogy. We know of no case in which the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) or the National Institute of Education have funded research projects in language and area studies, although FIPSE now participates in the support of a regional testing center for the commonly taught languages.

Despite its major involvement in Third World countries, AID does not provide research funds for research on those countries by language and area specialists. Even in its new program establishing long-term linkages between AID and universities, country specialists with other than technical competencies are not mentioned as scholars eligible for support under that program. Indeed, familiarity with the country or a language of the country in which a project is to take place is not given as a consideration in recruitment, although extra compensation is given for a candidate with a competency in a local language. Some of the other agencies have small funds for research support; for example, the Department of Agriculture funds a small program on research on Soviet agriculture.

A major determinant of the availability of funds for language and area studies research overseas in one or another country has been the existence of surplus currencies. As surplus currencies were exhausted in one country after another, the cross-sectional profile of language and area studies research shifted with it. Poland and Egypt were recently dropped from the list, leaving the countries of South Asia as the principal repository of surplus currency.

It is interesting to note the impact of these funds on the Smithsonian Institution's overseas research program. When the last of the rupees appropriated under PL 480 are exhausted in 1985, the last major reserve of such funds will be gone. The large research enterprise supported by PL 480 will have to find other sources of funds or disappear. The Smithsonian Institution is wisely escrowing some PL 480 funds against future expenditures for these purposes.

The time has surely come to examine the extent to which there is an effective fit between the characteristics of research in language and area studies, and the missions or programs of the various public and private funding agencies. Insofar as a proper fit is lacking, the national need for research in language and area studies may not be served. Unless the missions of the current granting agencies can be broadened to encompass these needs, a special funding mechanism dedicated to the research needs of language and area studies should be created. This can be administered through the NSF and the NEH for the social sciences and humanities respectively, through the Department of State, or through the Department of Education. The Smithsonian Institution represents an especially attractive setting for the administration of such a fund.

If the current dispersed funding pattern is maintained, then it is essential that the cross-sectional monitoring of the research product of language and area studies be carried out on a regular basis, so that the research provided by that pattern maximally serves the national need. Should the current imbalances and deficiencies continue, then a free-standing endowment paralleling those now in existence should be created. We will comment on this possibility in Chapter 7.

Recommendation:
Funds should be provided to encourage research on topics that are currently not receiving attention. Three research domains of high priority are 1) large- and medium-scale collaborative research in both the social sciences and the humanities; 2) research on broadly defined policy-relevant topics; and 3) research relating to language teaching in the less commonly taught languages. Support can be channeled through existing organizations, like the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Department of Education, the Department of State, or the Smithsonian Institution, but with funds clearly earmarked and awarded in special competitions. Title VI should be amended if necessary to permit the provision of a small general fund to each center, to be used for project development.

If the current pattern of agency granting of research funds is continued, then a central organization monitoring the effects of funding patterns on the cross-section of the research product should be created. If serious imbalances and gaps persist, a separate endowment to provide funds for international research should be created.

ACCESS TO OVERSEAS RESEARCH SITES

Problem:
Despite the existence of a durable network of transnational scholarly contacts, access to research sites has become increasingly difficult to negotiate in many countries, and, in some countries, the sponsorship of research by the Department of Defense may make access impossible.

Over the past 30 years, a major national resource has developed that both enhances our first-hand knowledge of other societies, and serves the long-range interests of American public diplomacy. A durable network of scholars transcending national boundaries now exists. These international linkages among scholars and scholarly organizations, by and large, tend to weather short-term swings in political relations between ourselves and other nations, and provide a major vehicle for back-door communications even in times of strained political relations.

Access to these societies below the official level, which scholarly networks facilitate, allows for a constant fresh flow of information of a very different sort than our short-term intelligence-gathering facilities can generate. Such networks also serve as a major resource for the training of new generations of American students. And ultimately these students become area specialists and act as contact points for foreign visitors, scholars, and their students, who come to the United States on officially sponsored leadership grants or who seek affiliation with a major American university.

To our knowledge, there has been no attention paid to the maintenance of these carefully crafted academic networks; they have grown up as a result of literally thousands of individual initiatives and a wide range of sources of overseas research support. They also often serve as facilitators for cultural exchanges aimed at the more general publics in the respective countries--museum exhibitions, drama, music, dance, tours, and film festivals.

Despite their value, recognized in other countries as well as in the United States, these relationships have become increasingly fragile as one country after another has introduced more and more rigorous official screening criteria and onerous demands on scholars and students seeking entry to conduct research--particularly, but not only, social science research. Some limitation by a sovereign nation of what foreigners may study is both understandable and desirable. Unfortunately, the process of restriction, once begun, has a tendency to escalate.

As a consequence, what was formerly unlimited access to carry out research--as is largely but not completely true in our own society--is now subject to an increasingly complex, sometimes idiosyncratic set of formal and informal rules for negotiating research permission. Any proposal to conduct research in a foreign country is now screened by a large number of intermediaries in the host country: a gaggle of ministries (the home or internal affairs ministry, the external affairs ministry, the education ministry, often the finance ministry); the state or provincial government, depending on the locale; a university; and at least one sponsoring faculty member who will act as a sort of guarantor of the bona fides of a visiting scholar or student.

In a few countries where this bureaucratic maze has taken on Byzantine proportions, or where research access has been sharply circumscribed, American scholars have established a center or institute to negotiate the necessary access, certify scholarly bona fides, and accumulate over the years the collective good will the individual scholarly contacts generate. The International Research and Exchanges Board and the American Institute of Indian Studies are two organizations that perform these functions in a very different fashion. They and others like them will be discussed in the next chapter, where we will deal with collective entities in the organization of the field.

The increasing barriers to research access have resulted from a variety of circumstances and take a variety of forms. The first barrier is a screening of topics. Many countries will not allow American scholars to study subjects considered politically sensitive, and this definition is constantly broadening. Similarly, many countries will not allow foreign scholars or students to travel to border regions, particularly those that are militarily sensitive or where there are border ethnic groups not fully absorbed into the national system.

The affiliation of the American researcher with an individual scholar and institution in the host country is an increasingly common requirement for research access. Affiliation may be difficult to arrange in countries that either temporarily or over the long term have a great deal of official hostility to the United States, or a very active university-based intelligentsia and set of student organizations that share such a hostility.

Equally troublesome is a practice that has grown up in several developing countries wherein an American research scholar or student is required to pay a substantial fee for research access. In the case of Nepal, this fee was recently set at one-half a professor's salary, and only through the efforts of the Social Science Research Council was this tax subsequently waived for degree-seeking students. Other countries have begun adopting a similar form of taxation.

The extent and the style of research access negotiations vary significantly by world area and by country. In the communist countries, access is totally controlled by the government. One consequence of this control is that it tends to bias access toward the "safe" humanities and away from contemporary issues.

While these research barriers are widespread, they are not universal. In most West European countries, Japan, and some Latin American countries, screening, if it exists, is pro forma. However, we believe that it is time to take a careful cross-sectional look at worldwide trends in limiting research access. This topic lies well within the original mandate of UNESCO--that is, the promotion of the freedom of ideas across national lines. Unfortunately, we see very little hope that UNESCO will be of much assistance in this matter in the near future.

If anything is to be done, it will have to be through the efforts of the scholars in the United States and the federal government. We would urge that after a thorough country-by-country review of the current situation,[6] a quiet campaign be launched either bilaterally or through regional organizations to set mutually agreed-upon research guidelines both for U.S. scholars and students going abroad, and for foreign students coming to the United States. So far, the piecemeal, one-way, unilateral decisions taken in many countries have not generally been to our national advantage or to that of the free exchange of information.

As part of the mandate of the study, we tried to assess whether sponsorship of overseas research by the DOD would affect these increasingly fragile access networks or would impede a scholar's or student's access to his research site in another country. The question we asked is whether in today's international political climate, the source of funding for overseas research would make a major difference in negotiating research access.

We found a great variety of opinion, depending upon which set of countries we were discussing and the particular discipline of the scholar. Scholars dealing with Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, and Southeast and South Asia anticipated that direct DOD funding of overseas research would introduce fresh and often insuperable obstacles into the screening process and into their relationships with scholarly colleagues. Some very distinguished scholars who are collaborating with Mexican counterparts state flatly that their joint work would cease abruptly if DOD support entered the picture. Scholars studying East Asia, the Soviet Union, and Western Europe anticipated less difficulty. There was also some difference by discipline. Anthropologists and political scientists were most apprehensive; those in the applied disciplines, linguists, and many humanists were somewhat less concerned. To assure ourselves that we were not getting responses tied to domestic political considerations, we corresponded with a number of private foundation representatives permanently stationed in various parts of the world. The responses we received generally reflected the positions of the scholars.

We strongly believe that the DOD and the rest of American government and society have a major stake in sustaining our ability to conduct overseas research. It would be an immense loss if we had to retreat to the kind of stay-at-home secondary, library-based research that was so common before World War II. We would, however, urge that at this stage of negotiations for research access, any direct DOD sponsorship of the overseas research of language and area specialists be channeled only into work on Western Europe, East Asia, or the Soviet Union. Even there, however, it would be more useful if a multi-department sponsorship of ongoing scholarly relationships were the vehicle for such support. At the end of this report, we will have a suggestion to make about how the various mission-oriented agencies including the DOD can contribute to sustaining this valuable national resource in a fashion that will not endanger its vitality.

Recommendation:
A major review should be undertaken of the obstacles to research access in other countries, with a view to establishing bilateral mutual agreements to counter the deteriorating situation.

Direct Department of Defense funding of overseas research should be done with great care and openness, and should be confined to those countries and situations where scholarly access to research sites will not as a consequence be threatened.

NOTES

[1] Richard D. Lambert et al., "National Target for South Asia Specialists" (New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies. 1981).

[2] While these two disciplines have very different research perspectives and styles, in dealing with Third World countries, it is often impossible to separate them in terms of the specific topic of the research.

[3] Kenneth Prewitt, "Introduction," Social Science Research Council Annual Report (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1982), p. xxiv.

[4] Cited in SRI International, "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe," prepared for the Association of American Universities (Arlington, VA: SRI International, 1983), p. 2.

[5] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[6] We are aware that an unofficial inquiry on the question of research clearances required of U.S. scholars abroad was conducted in 1983 by the Academic Relations and Program Development, Office of Academic Programs, of the USIA. 28 countries in all major regions of the world were included in the survey, and of these, responses were received from 26.

5
Campus-Based and National Organizations

So far we have concentrated on individual language and area specialists--their language competency, their area competency, and their research product. In this section, we are concerned with the organizations that are active in the field, both those serving the collective interests of faculty and students on campuses, and those at the regional or national level that aggregate and facilitate the activities of the field as a whole.

CAMPUS-BASED CENTERS

Problem:
Federal funding under Title VI has provided crucial flexible support for the collective activities of campus-based language and area studies programs. But the effectiveness of this support has been eroded by inflation, by the brevity of the grant cycle, by shifting selection criteria based on policy swings within the Department of Education, and by periodic efforts to abolish the program.

The basic unit of national planning for language and area studies has historically been and remains the campus-based language and area studies center. As we indicated in the Preamble, what constitutes a center, particularly at the lower end of the scale as to size, disciplinary spread, and degree of institutionalization, is uncertain at best. As noted in that chapter, we believe that the full range of center types and functions warrants national review. Given the focus of this review--advanced research and training--we deliberately concentrated our interviewing at the upper end of the continuum in terms of size and degree of institutionalization. However, since we tended to interview representatives of all centers on the campuses we visited, and since typically the centers on any campus were at different levels of development, we did include a number of centers not at the top of the national scale. Indeed, on a single campus we were able to compare those that did receive federal support with those that did not. Moreover, we included a number of programs at universities and colleges that we knew to be below the top, to ensure a fuller perspective than an investigation of federally supported programs alone would yield. Nonetheless, the focal point of this review is the research-oriented, graduate-level centers, particularly those that have been receiving federal support under Title VI.

We should also add that on many campuses, the center does not include all of a university's activities with respect to a world area. Particularly where there are substantial technical-assistance programs--as at many land grant universities, where some of the disciplinary departments are themselves highly cosmopolitan and internationally linked--or where active exchange programs are in operation, the language and area center comprises only a subset of the university's interests directed at a particular country or world area. One sign of a highly successful center is that it draws its circle large enough to include all of these interests.

For the present purpose, we will focus on those centers that have been or might be receiving federal support--in particular, support through Title VI. We will begin with the present pattern of federal support for language and area studies centers, asking what role this support is playing now, whether it should be continued, and how it might be made more effective. We will then turn to the kinds of fresh centers and center support that might be appropriate for the coming decades.

Center Functions

We started our inquiry, particularly our campus visits, with an open mind as to whether the center mechanism continued to be a necessary and fruitful way of supporting language and area studies. Would it be better to channel funds to individual specialists, to projects, to students, to national rather than campus-based organizations?

Our campus visits, however, made it clear that the centers perform a variety of important functions for language and area studies that would be unlikely to survive if support for centers were to disappear. Indeed, on campus after campus, our interviews with university administrators, center directors and faculty, and students made it clear that the vitality of language and area studies would be seriously diminished without the centers. At least one dean had gone through the exercise of calculating the extra expense of having a center on a campus, balanced it against what the economists call "value added" by centers, and concluded that even in terms of the internal economy of the university, the maintenance of the center made fiscal as well as intellectual and educational sense. When to this reckoning is added the extra-university functions that centers--as distinct from individual scholars--perform, functions important to the national interest, the case for continued federal support of centers is persuasive.

What is this "value added"? What makes the center add up to more than the sum of its parts? How can one tell a successful center from an unsuccessful one?

Maintaining an Interdisciplinary Critical Mass

Given the interdisciplinary nature of area studies, it is essential that on a particular campus there be a critical mass of faculty from different disciplines. The center not only embodies that disciplinary spread, but enhances and sustains it. As we have noted throughout this report, there has been an increasing tendency for language and area studies to contract to its core disciplines--anthropology, history, language and literature, and political science. Another way of approaching the question of core disciplines is to identify those in which a knowledge of language and culture cannot be taken for granted, but which are nevertheless indispensable to interdisciplinary attention to an area. These lie in the main within the theoretical and quantitatively oriented social sciences, and as more than one dean pointed out, it is in these disciplines that the contribution to the critical mass is increasingly in danger.

One after another university administrator and center director discussed the difficulty of making appointments that combine disciplinary and area strength in economics, sociology, and even in political science and anthropology. We were told that the availability of money is not enough to ensure the appointment of much-desired area-oriented economists. Issues of the future direction of the discipline as seen by department chairmen and faculty take precedence in recruitment and promotion procedures. This is most often expressed as a concern on the part of non-area-oriented faculty and administrators about the consequences for the quality of social science departments if there are "too many" area specialists. The problem of balance comes up especially, but not exclusively, in small departments.

On the other hand, the main concern of area-oriented social scientists is that there are too few of them, and that those who are on hand will be replaced by mainstream scholars. Some indication of this problem, and its disciplinary specificity in the field of Soviet and East European studies, can be seen in Warren Eason's "Dynamic Inventory" questionnaire. Table 5.1 indicates the responses to his 1981 survey to the following question: "When the time comes that you leave your present employment--through retirement or otherwise--what do you think is the likelihood that you will be replaced with someone who is, to one degree or another, a specialist on the Soviet Union and/or Eastern Europe?"

Table 5.1

Expectations Among Soviet and East European Specialists of Being Replaced by Area Specialists, by Discipline

	VERY LIKELY %	LIKELY %	POSSIBLY %	UNLIKELY %	VERY UNLIKELY %	NOT APPL. %	TOTAL NUMBER
DISCIPLINE							
Lang/Lit	40.0	9.7	14.0	9.7	16.3	10.3	300
PoliSci	24.0	15.9	24.5	13.7	12.9	9.0	233
Econ/Geog	9.7	7.3	16.9	31.4	24.2	10.5	124
OVERALL PERCENTAGE	28.6	11.4	18.3	15.2	16.6	9.9	657

Source: Eason, "A Dynamic Inventory."

Area-oriented center directors and faculty see specific combinations of area and disciplinary competency as hard-to-hit moving targets, particularly in these times when university resources as a whole are stretched thin. We discussed in Chapter 3 some unusual steps that might be taken to assure replacement for a highly select combination of scarce skills. However, in the normal course of things and for most appointments, the advocacy role performed by the organized center and its director, linked with a small fund to defray part of the initial costs of an appointment, increase the likelihood that an area-relevant appointment will be made.

A strong center not only is able to spread its net throughout the social sciences and into the applied and professional disciplines, but it is also able to involve fully in the center's activities people from disciplines normally inhospitable to language and area studies. Centers are not so much fixed-boundary entities as magnets with variable force fields to pull in marginal faculty and students. One indication of this is the reported percentage of time that different kinds of faculty members report spending on the program. Table 5.2 indicates for each discipline the percentage of faculty titularly associated with the center who spend more or less than one-fourth of their time on center activities. A sure sign that the centripetal pull of the center is diminishing--or the sign of a weak compared with a strong center--is the slippage of more and more faculty into the loosely connected margins of center activities.

It is not enough, of course, to maintain the proper spread of disciplines among the faculty, the minimal critical mass defined in both senses of core disciplines. It is essential that this be an interacting group, that there be a common intellectual life of the center: research seminars on lively topics, frequent contact and shared intellectual interest among faculty and students across disciplinary lines. a collectively maintained publication program, a constant stream of visitors from other campuses and abroad. It is the evidence of this lively common intellectual life that

Table 5.2

Number of Faculty Spending More Than 25% and Number of Faculty Spending 25% or Less of Their Time on Center Activities

	AF		EA		EE		IA		LA		ME		SA		SE	
	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS	OVER 25%	25% OR LESS
DISCIPLINE																
History	15	–	52	1	34	9	3	2	22	3	30	8	11	3	3	–
Language-Related	22	6	70	3	81	9	6	2	56	8	53	9	39	4	10	–
Arts	8	1	23	4	8	7	–	3	11	4	8	8	11	7	6	1
Relig/Phil	–	–	12	2	4	1	–	1	–	–	9	1	12	1	2	–
Area Studies	2	2	1	–	10	–	6	–	2	1	18	–	–	1	–	–
Economics	8	2	14	7	7	4	–	1	20	8	5	1	8	4	7	3
Anthropology	15	1	13	2	4	3	–	–	40	5	11	6	11	2	10	–
Sociology	3	3	9	–	4	–	–	–	12	12	4	2	3	1	3	2
Psychology	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	1	2	–	–	1	–	–	–
Archaeology	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	6	1	1	–	–	–
Geography	5	2	3	–	8	1	–	2	6	5	7	2	3	1	3	–
PoliSci	8	3	21	5	22	8	–	1	18	1	12	3	14	1	5	1
Applied	14	10	18	14	22	10	–	1	31	42	7	6	8	9	4	7

several campus administrators used to judge the vitality of a center.

Student Training

The aggregation of a multi-disciplinary faculty is not an end in itself. As we noted in the last chapter, it could--and in too many centers does not--serve as a locus of collaborative research. More commonly, the critical mass of the faculty assists in the recruitment and training of students. By and large, there is correspondence between the strength of area-related faculty in general and the quality of graduate students, even though graduate students usually register for degrees in disciplinary departments and, as we noted earlier, for most of their training remain within disciplinary lines.

Our interviews indicated that for many students, while the disciplinary department is the arena in which their degree is pursued, the center is what attracted them to the university and holds them there; takes an interest in their degree progress; helps them find the fellowship support to pursue their studies; and provides the physical space for them to be with others who share the problems and joys of learning a difficult language, doing research in remote and dangerous places, and thinking that a particular part of the world is exciting. The role of a center in inducing students to spend the extra resources and long period of time needed to become language and area specialists cannot be overestimated.

Sustaining Language Instruction

The part of the teaching function of direct concern to the center, and--except for Latin American and West European studies--which the center often controls or staffs, is language instruction. We discussed in Chapter 2 the problems inherent in sustaining instruction in the less commonly taught languages, particularly those for which there is sporadic and very low student demand. It is the center that attempts to maintain this instruction and to guide students through it.

Managing Area-Related Resources

The center serves to accumulate resources for both research and teaching with respect to the area. The amassing of appropriate library resources, newspapers, up-to-date journals, films, audio-visual materials and various ephemera, to use the librarians' term--that is, government and business information, broadcast monitoring, and so forth--is also a center responsibility. Where centers are strong, area-relevant library collections are strong. It is highly unlikely that we could have produced such collections, unmatched anywhere in the world, without the special attention and advocacy of centers.

Serving External Clienteles

These four functions all relate to activities that are largely internal to the university. The centers also serve a variety of functions for external clienteles. In part, but only in part, because of the requirement of Title VI funding, centers perform a variety of outreach activities. They and their faculty help other colleges and universities develop teaching materials and programs with respect to their area. They share library resources and visiting speakers with them. They work with secondary and elementary schools to accomplish the same purpose. They provide information services for the media, especially when a political crisis propels a particular country or region into the headlines. They provide a reference, consultation, and in several cases a regular source of commercial statistics and information for business. They provide consultants and speakers for both government and public affairs needs. And they provide a principal and durable link between American intellectual life and that of other countries. It is often to and through the centers that scholars from the countries in their area enter and fan out through American academic life, and for many countries it is through them that ideas tend to flow back and forth.

Maintaining Center Strength

Many factors go into distinguishing a successful center from an unsuccessful one. For instance, again and again we saw the crucial role of a strong and devoted leader, and the fragility of the center's functioning when one is lost. For the purposes of this review, however, we would like to concentrate on two aspects: the importance of commitment by the university administration to the center's well-being, and the role of external, particularly federal, funding.

Commitment of the university can be reflected in the amount of money it provides for the collective activities of the center, in addition to the salary costs of the faculty. In many universities, the centers themselves receive central university funds for their administrative costs; in others this underwriting of costs comes in other ways. Sometimes universities appoint central coordinators of all area-related activities, coordinators who often swing more weight than the individual center directors could on their own.

A further indication of university commitment is the extent to which administrators are willing to use their muscle to help secure area-oriented appointments in "difficult" departments. The most extreme form of this is where centers are allowed to draw upon a limited pool of university-wide positions, including endowed chairs, or where the administration, through central fiat, requires that an area-qualified scholar be replaced by another such scholar upon his departure or retirement.

Perhaps the most telling indicator of university commitment to area studies is its posture with regard to enrollments in the courses taught under the center's aegis. This includes not just the language courses, about which we spoke in Chapter 2, but area studies courses as well. The introductory courses in the core disciplines tend to be secure, since many of them attract substantial numbers of undergraduates who take them as part of their general education or distribution requirements. The dangerously low enrollments tend to be in the upper-level courses taught largely to advanced specialists, or the courses specializing in particular countries or time periods that such specialist training requires. For a university administrator, the survey and lower-level courses in the core disciplines are not the issue, although paradoxically the disciplinary departments tend to get credit for these higher-enrollment, lower-level courses. Rather, the issue is the number of specialized courses--and therefore the number of staff members teaching such courses--that have enrollments below 20 or even 10 students. Of course, area studies groups and centers differ in this respect, but Table 5.3 shows the load of low-enrollment courses that area studies must justify.

It is not easy to assess the significance of low enrollments based upon the campus interviews. In a few places, administrators openly admit that there are penalties for low enrollments. In discussions with administrators in some of the prestigious private universities as well as some public ones, the notion that enrollments matter is strongly resisted. What our interviews showed, however, is that no matter how tolerant or generous the administration may be with regard to low enrollments, those faculty members whose courses are sparsely attended feel quite vulnerable. At best, they appreciate the protection they receive; at worst, they fear that the tolerance may soon end or deplore penalties they think they have already incurred.

Another indication of university commitment is the extent to which the university assists the program in securing external funding. While university and federal funds still make up the bulk of the support for Title VI programs, more and more of them are diversifying their sources of external support. The 1981 Rockefeller Foundation survey of international relations research centers, which included 39 Title VI centers, collected information on their sources of support.[1] In a further analysis of these data for our project by Kenneth Goody, a consultant at the Rockefeller Foundation, it became clear that 18 of the 39 Title VI centers in the Rockefeller sample were receiving private foundation support; 13 had corporate support; 8 received gifts from

Table 5.3

Number of Courses by Size of Enrollment in 39 Title VI Centers by World Area, 1982

	SIZE OF COURSE BY ENROLLMENT						
	1-10		11-20		21 +		
WORLD AREA	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	NO. OF COURSES	% OF TOTAL	TOTAL COURSES
AF	67	50%	33	25%	33	25%	133
EA	329	58%	118	21%	122	21%	569
EE	278	57%	98	20%	112	23%	488
IA	8	38%	2	10%	11	52%	21
LA	137	46%	76	26%	82	28%	295
ME	197	59%	83	25%	56	17%	336
SA	114	67%	36	21%	20	12%	170
SE	31	53%	12	20%	16	27%	59

Note: This table enumerates area-specific courses, not including language courses. Courses are divided into three groups by number of students.

individuals; 9 had endowment funds; and 10 had other sources of income. And, as the Rockefeller report points out, more and more of these centers are diversifying their external support.

These are healthy signs of center entrepreneurship and university administrative backing. The assistance of university administrations, particularly development offices, is especially helpful in securing endowment funds. It is worth noting the university commitment involved in these endowments: such funds are raised with considerable effort, and the university often makes an explicit choice about designating them for an international or some other purpose. The raising of private endowment funds for area-related activities has been characteristic of private universities, but is now occurring in public ones as well.

The Role of Title VI Support

To summarize the preceding discussion, what makes a center viable and valuable are those central activities and resources that make one plus one equal more than two--that is. make combinations of faculty and students more productive than they would be separately. By far the largest part of the resources to accomplish this task must and does now come from the universities themselves. Since in the long run it is the universities' commitments to the maintenance of these programs that will count, we would recommend that the provision of external funds be tied to evidence of the kind of financial and other university commitment we have outlined.

Nevertheless, in on-campus interviews, administrators and faculty alike stressed the fact that they saw these centers as serving a national as well as a local purpose, and that federal funding, particularly of the kind provided by Title VI, was an important affirmation that the national interest was being served. Moreover, many were fearful that in the long run, given the economic pressures within universities and despite the good intentions of administrators, their heavy investments in language and area center resources would slip away should federal support for the centers evaporate.

One reason for this fear is that as the primary long-term support for language and area studies centers, Title VI has made possible precisely those centralized activities described above as primary functions of the centers: some marginal investment in necessary faculty whose appointment is difficult because their discipline holds area specialization in low esteem; support for low-enrollment courses that the internal economy of the university would not otherwise bear; student support to cover the costs of unusually elaborate and prolonged training; funds for special library staff and for area-relevant acquisitions; the support of conferences, visiting lecturers, faculty travel, and outreach activities connecting the center to the rest of the nation and to its world area; and the provision of some administration and some central space to pull together the various parts. Over the years, with very little guidance from the Department of Education on the internal allocation of funds provided for general support of centers, a fairly consistent pattern of expenditure of Title VI funds--a pattern reflecting just these functions--has developed in almost every center.

Table 5.4 shows the expenditures under Title VI for a typical year in each of these expenditure categories. While the columns refer to different years, a comparison made at five-year intervals showed that the pattern of expenditures is quite stable from year to year. Unfortunately, a decade ago the Department of Education stopped collecting the detailed information on which the Title VI dependency estimates were made, so we have no recent data on this important question; but interviews with center directors indicate that there has been relatively little change in this as well. Indeed, many center directors report that. especially with the shrinkage in the total center costs borne by Title VI, all of that money is now so firmly committed to long-standing purposes that there is little "free money" with which to experiment on innovation and new directions.

The first column of Table 5.4 shows the proportion of the total allocation devoted to each expenditure category. The second column indicates what might be called Title VI dependency--that is, for each category, the percentage of all expenditures, both internal and external, that is supported by Title VI funds. These figures, particularly the second column, make clear why Title VI plays such an important role on the campus, despite the limited share of faculty salaries it provides. If one adds in the fellowships available to graduate students training to be specialists--not included in this table--it is evident why Title VI funds are so important to the vitality of the centers. They

Table 5.4

Title VI Expenditures, 1973

CATEGORY	% OF COMBINED UNIVERSITY AND TITLE VI EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORY	% OF EACH CATEGORY DEPENDENT ON TITLE VI FUNDS
Administrative/ Clerical	6.9	18.3
Language Faculty	26.4	10.3
Area Faculty	36.9	5.5
Library Staff	9.2	8.4
Library Acquisitions	6.0	26.7
Foreign Travel	1.2	26.1
Lecturers/ Conferences, etc.	1.3	38.4
Other	4.8	22.9
Subtotal	92.5	11.1
Indirect Costs	7.4	11.2
TOTAL	100	-
GRAND MEAN	-	11.1

Note: The first column of figures represents the percentage for each category of the total expenditures of both university contributions and Title VI grants. These 1973 data are the latest statistics available on university expenditures on language and area studies programs.

support the collective as against the individual activities of the center. They help make one plus one equal more than two.

Unfortunately, even if the role of Title VI is important to the centers, it is both uncertain and increasingly marginal. The field has been treated to a series of proposals by several administrations for precipitous and extreme fluctuations in the level of funding, including several proposals to abolish such support entirely. This boom-or-bust situation has had a severe dampening effect on the development of the field. Fortunately, congressional action has forestalled such radical shifts in Title VI funding.

Moreover, the share of center costs that Title VI provides has been declining steadily, from 10.7% in 1973-74, to 9.1% in 1976-77, to 7.7% in 1981-82. This decline has resulted from the fact that over the past five years, the increase in the absolute level of support given to centers has been at about half the inflation rate, as measured by the GNP and CPI deflators, while the total center costs have remained level or have increased slightly.

And finally, the biennial cycle of center awards, tied to periodic shifts in the number of centers to be supported and in the criteria for selection of centers--shifts in which it is often difficult to determine just what national interest was being served--makes long-range planning for a center or a university quite difficult. Universities and students cannot switch directions this rapidly. The result has been that both follow a strategy based upon minimal federal inputs, with consequent loss of center stability and of student recruitment and commitment.

We believe that there are important national purposes to be served by the maintenance of campus-based language and area studies centers; that Title VI provides the kind of flexible support at the core of activities that is extremely helpful, if not irreplaceable, in these financially difficult times; that this support ought to be maintained at a level at least commensurate with inflation; and that it should be committed for a long enough period to permit sensible planning in the mid-term, both by universities and by the federal government. We believe that a five-year cycle is optimal, but that the expiration dates of awards should be staggered so that there are opportunities to add expanding centers and to drop others that, for one reason or another, decline.

Recommendation:
A general, flexible support program, such as that contained in the current Title VI program, should be continued, since it is essential for the well-being of the field. A major criterion in the provision of such federal support should be evidence of a strong and continuing university commitment.

Center support should be on a five-year cycle, with staggered competitions to allow adding to or deleting from the existing pool of federally supported centers in interim years.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN CENTER SUPPORT

Problem:
The laissez-faire system of program support under Title VI has served well the growth stage of language and area studies, but does not encourage the building of new strengths in substantive domains of great national importance.

So far we have been presenting the case for the appropriateness of federal expenditures in the general support of language and area centers, and indicating how vital these expenditures are to the sustenance of existing programs. However, looking toward the next quarter of a century, we believe that it would be in the national interest to supplement existing support by targeting funds for the creation of specially focused new centers or of new segments attached to existing centers.

We see these new centers or segments not as substitutes for existing programs, but as national resources that will extend language and area studies into domains that the laissez-faire system has not fully developed. In a number of cases, the special long-term interests of business and of mission-oriented federal agencies can be served by investing in centers or center segments that are tailored to the substantive domains of their particular interest--always keeping in mind that campus-based organizations are effective in carrying out basic research and training, and are less optimal for contract research aimed at short-term, mission-focused inquiries.

We believe that one of the principal reasons for the limited utilization of language and area studies research, faculty, and students has been that the administration of Title VI has discouraged the center specialization that might have drawn together a number of individuals sharing long-term interests in a particular set of issues, especially those of policy relevance. Title VI center support competitions, and the model of the ideal center they project, encourage the development of comprehensive centers, maximally spread across disciplines, languages, countries, and functions. There are no points given in the competition for depth of coverage with reference to any particular discipline or topic. As a consequence, disciplinary coverage in many centers is a mile wide and an inch thin.

Given this selection process and its implied model of the fully developed program, any mission-oriented agency or group interested in developing a particular functional or topical area-related strength has had no way to encourage one or more centers to specialize in those kinds of topics, short of trying to change the guidelines that apply to all centers at the same time. There is little or no precedent for long-term investment in particular strengths in one or a few language and area centers. Short-term project money, yes; durable support, no.

While this universal model of the ideal center has worked well in the growth stage of language and area studies, it needs to be supplemented to meet the national needs in the future. We believe that it is time to supplement the general support given to all Title VI centers with additional funds based on national competitions for a series of much more focused goals.

In the interest of parsimony and discouraging further proliferation of centers, first priority ought to be given to supplementing existing centers with specializing segments. But in the absence of satisfactory candidates, it might be necessary to establish new centers combining the general purposes of language and area studies--teaching, research, accumulation of library and other resources, consultation, public service--with a focus on a particular topical domain. Centers would not only be training centers, as language and area centers are now, but would also provide a focal point for major research and consultative activities. To illustrate the point, here are a few domains that would appear natural foci for supplemental center coverage.

1. *Language instruction resource units*. We have already mentioned the proposed language instruction resource units. We described the nature of their organization and functions in the discussion in Chapter 2 of language competencies. They are a good example of the type of new center or segment added to an existing center that we have in mind. It is interesting to note that the Department of Education has chosen to make a limited number of targeted grants in fiscal year 1984 for specific aspects of language teaching improvement. However, these new functions added on to a limited number of existing centers are viewed by the department as pilot projects, a first step toward including these features in all centers in the near future--which means returning quickly to the *universal* criteria of the current application procedure. In contrast, we have in mind more durable, *specialized* centers or center segments to work at raising the level of language instruction over the long haul.

2. *Instruction in the least commonly taught languages and areas*. Another domain that has already been mentioned is long-term support for the teaching of

courses on languages and countries other than those that most programs dealing with a world area are likely to offer. We have already discussed the possibility of specially targeted faculty and student support in such areas and languages.

3. Undergraduate-level education. A third domain is one that currently represents a sort of blind spot in Title VI support--that is, language and area studies as a way of organizing teaching at the undergraduate, general-education level. From the beginning of the Title VI program, there have been undergraduate language and area studies centers, except for a brief period after the major contractions in the number of centers in 1973-74. At the present time, there are two such undergraduate Title VI centers for most of the area studies groups. However, status as a funded Title VI undergraduate center has generally been awarded to programs that resemble the graduate-level centers but have not yet developed as fully or as comprehensively. It is true that there is now an undergraduate component to Title VI support, but the focus of this part of the program has been short-term seed money grants for the development of international studies, defined as topical themes cutting across national boundaries or "global awareness"--that is, a generalized sensitizing to other societies and international affairs.

It is unclear why the language and area studies programs truly aimed at undergraduate general education were dropped, even though the bulk of the teaching that many language and area specialists do on their campuses is aimed at undergraduate general education. Moreover, many first-rate liberal arts colleges lacking the graduate-level advanced-training superstructure of Title VI centers might be top candidates for status as a center with the specific mandate of improving our undergraduate-level teaching capacity with respect to particular world areas.

We note that the National Advisory Board on International Education Programs of the Department of Education has just issued a report, Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action, whose goal is to improve the capacity of our educational system at all levels, to educate our citizenry about the realities of our interrelated world, and to provide a more satisfactory national educational policy with respect to foreign language instruction. It would be a tragedy if the nation's very substantial language and area studies resources were not harnessed to that task, and the most likely link to that effort is through a deliberate focus on undergraduate general education.

4. The business interface. New centers or center segments should be created to specialize in the interface between business and language and area studies. We see no point in urging all or even most centers to develop such an interface, despite much of the current rhetoric. For one thing, business demand is spotty, in terms of both country coverage and employment prospects. There is much pioneering and pattern setting to be done in this area before programmatic changes can be more widely introduced, and a few centers specifically devoted to this exploration could make a genuine contribution.

We think it especially important that centers focusing on business or foreign trade should have an active research agenda to demonstrate the utility to business concerns of language- and area-specific work. Federal support should be contingent upon the securing of long-term matching funds from more than one business source. The Department of Commerce and other agencies and organizations interested in our international economic affairs could participate in the allocation of federal support for these targeted centers.

The new Part B of Title VI provides funds for the support of campus-based programs concerned with international business. It seems odd that there has been no attempt to link at least part of that effort to existing Title VI centers, or to promoting area-specific basic research that might be of interest to business. The link between Part B and the remainder of Title VI would be natural. As an example, despite the lack of programmatic intent to include language and area centers as competitors for Part B funds, the only three large-scale grants awarded in the first year of that new support program involved major language and area studies centers.

We would urge that as funding under Part B of Title VI increases--it has grown from $1 million in the first year of operation to $2 million in the second--a deliberate attempt be made to link some part of those funds to long-term support to create business-related segments in existing language and area studies centers. These segments might develop joint M.A./M.B.A. programs; language and/or area training opportunities for M.B.A.'s short of a joint degree; new courses focusing on the political economy of countries of special interest to business; or systematic research of area topics important to the maintenance or expansion of American business.

5. Research on foreign policy. Earlier we remarked on the spottiness of the research conducted by language and area studies center faculty on matters relating to the foreign policies either of the United States toward other countries, or of countries toward nations other than the United States. It was precisely this latter shortage of research on Soviet foreign policy that the Rockefeller Foundation tried to overcome with its recent grants to Columbia University and to Stanford-Berkeley. We also note that the Department of State's well-established linkages with campus-based language and area specialists are by and large episodic and individual.

We do not mean to limit these highly productive individual linkages, nor to make it impossible for the foreign policy professionals to draw on the talents of a large number of individuals scattered throughout the university community. However, in our view, the establishment of one or two centers or center segments in each area studies group with a focus on foreign policy questions--particularly when an accurate reading of the perspective of a particular country or region is required--would be a useful addition to our national capacity to deal with long-term foreign policy issues. It would help fill the gap we discussed earlier, wherein the proprietary contract research organizations cannot staff up for the long haul with expertise on very many countries, and the academic centers tend not to have the faculty versed in the issues our foreign policy faces.

One subset of foreign policy issues deals with national security and strategic and military affairs. As indicated by our own analysis of a cross-section of the published product of professionals, national security studies is a domain in which language and area specialists have contributed relatively little. And yet many of the principal issues of national security facing our nation call for deep country-specific knowledge, enriched by the ability to read materials written in the language of the country involved. Calls for research contracts sent out to all of the language and area centers dealing with particular world areas have gathered only a small portion of the relevant expertise they should have. Such appeals for ad hoc contracts have raised a set of symbolic concerns on some campuses and in some area studies professional associations--concerns about mixing too freely the highly specialized missions of foreign affairs agencies with the many other scholarly activities of the centers and their faculty.

Existing individual relationships are, or course, useful and should be continued. However, a more focused interface--concentrated in a few highly visible language and area studies centers. with those centers competing quite publicly, in a national competition, for status as a specialized center in national security affairs--would clear much of the air domestically and in the host countries, and would provide the foreign affairs community with clusters of country-specific expertise directly related to its concerns.

6. Research on development. Another example of policy-relevant centers or center segments are those related to the development mission of organizations like the Agency for International Development (AID). Particularly with reference to African and Latin American studies, it would seem to be in the national interest to establish a few centers or center segments in universities where long-range programs of AID dealing with

those parts of the world are already located. These center segments could provide the language skills and training and the area expertise to enrich the context for overseas development programs.

More specifically, it seems odd that no thought was given to including some linguistically competent area specialists in AID's newly created Joint Career Corps program, whose announced goal is to establish "an elite corps of senior professionals having a major impact on the scientific aspects of the Agency's programs as well as on the nature of related teaching and research at their universities."[2] The same observation holds true for AID's Title XII Matching Formula University Strengthening Grants. Surely some language competencies and general country expertise would be helpful, particularly for work in cultures as different from our own as those of Africa or South Asia. This Title XII program could provide a highly useful model for the development of policy-relevant language and area studies centers or center segments.

Recommendation:
A number of supplemental centers or center segments should be established via national competition, to focus their research and teaching on relatively neglected aspects in the internal development of language and area studies, such as 1) language pedagogy; 2) the special demands of successful undergraduate education for non-specialists; and 3) policy-relevant issues of special concern to business and to the mission-oriented federal agencies. For the latter purposes, funding from those agencies should be provided.

THE NUMBER OF CENTERS

Problem:
At the present time, there is no rational basis, other than the amount of money appropriated, to determine how many centers the federal government should support.

The most frequent question asked by policy makers concerned with Title VI is how many programs there should be, or, more pointedly, how many programs the federal government should support. Nearly always, the implication of this question is that there has been an excessive proliferation of centers, and some concentration is in order. We believe that this is the wrong question, or at best it is premature, and needs considerable refinement.

The reason the question keeps recurring is that in the current laissez-faire stage of language and area studies, the centers are viewed as a set of training programs differentiated only by world area, producing a number of undifferentiated students to be specialists. Hence, it is natural that debates about the appropriate number of centers should rest solely on the overall number of students graduating with an area specialty and the short-term job market for their skills. It was this conception of the role of centers that moved the administration to propose the withdrawal of support for all centers following a Rand Corporation report showing that the unemployment rate of center graduates had increased. This decision was made even though the reported rate of unemployment among Foreign Language and Area Studies graduates was only 4.8%,[3] or about half the national general unemployment rate.

Even if one does not subscribe to this all-or-nothing view of federal support for centers, the current status of centers means that the only recourse to pressures of fiscal restraint or to notions of slackening market demand is to reduce the number of centers overall, excluding those that fall below the new cut-off point in terms of size and overall quality. This is what has happened in the past. Largely in response to shifting levels of appropriation, the number of centers to be supported has moved up or down the continuum. At the peak, 1970, there were 107 Title VI-funded language and area studies programs. The number dropped to 46 in 1973-74, and has now increased to 76 with no particular rationale for any of these numbers, other than the amount of money Congress had appropriated in that year. There was no attention to what specifically in terms of coverage or student training was lost by these cuts, or what remained among those that continued to be supported.

Before a rational answer can be given to the question of how many centers the federal government should support, three interrelated changes have to take place. First, the view of a language and area center as being solely a producer of Ph.D.-level specialists must be changed; second, in the next stage of language and area studies, a much greater concern for specialized strengths should inform national policy; and third, much more rigorous evaluation of centers should be introduced.

To take the first of these points, we believe that a decision on the number of centers to be supported based entirely on the short-term market demand for graduates represents a narrow perspective on the functions of centers and their cost and benefit to the nation. For one thing, we have recommended that in the next phase of language and area studies, a major drive be undertaken to bring effective national demand a bit closer to national need. Second, as we have also indicated above, centers perform a variety of functions that are in the national interest over and above the training of advanced-level specialists. They provide an international perspective in the education of a substantial portion of each generation's educated citizenry. They act as advocates for deparochializing much of the college and university curriculum, including that of the business and other professional schools. They offer the library resources, publications, seminars, and faculty and student exchanges that link us with scholars and other intellectuals in foreign countries. They provide a flow of publicly available information from the basic research of their faculty members. They provide consultants for the formulation of public policy, for the media, and for other levels of the educational system.

It is hard to imagine the operation of our democratic society, which is now fully enmeshed in a complex world, without the constant flow of information on other countries generated in these centers. Without such centers, the nation would have to create at least one counterpart for each world area in much the same way as the Soviets have done with their area-specific Academies, or in other countries' government-run institutes.

Leaving aside the obvious advantages of having a set of centers independent of the government and embedded firmly in our educational system, our system is infinitely more parsimonious with tax dollars. Based upon an extrapolation of the average current operating costs of a fully developed center at $1.5 million annually, it would cost $15 million per year to create one fully tax-supported center for all 10 world areas, and this figure does not include the overhead costs of buildings, utilities, administration, retirement, and so forth. For about $10 million in tax dollars annually under Title VI, the nation has 76 high-quality language and area studies centers spread throughout the major American research universities. The total costs of these programs to the universities now amounts to more than $100 million. The $100,000 or so of federal dollars that currently goes to support an average campus-based center whose expenditure on direct costs is $1.5 million annually is an excellent investment, even in economic terms.

If one turns to criteria other than cost, a judgment on how many centers in all should be federally supported depends on whether one sees the need for a major deparochializing of our educational system. This is in fact a goal proposed by any number of recent reports on education--to name just a few, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies report, Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability; the National Commission on Excellence in Education report, A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform; Ernest Boyer's Carnegie Commission report, High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America; Signs of Trouble and Erosion: A Report on Graduate Education in America by the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance; and the report of the National Advisory Board on International Education Programs of the Department of

Education, Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action. If such a major transformational role is envisaged, or even if such a limited goal as a recent White House proposal to send several thousand American students to Japanese colleges is to be made realistic, we have too few centers. These considerations would argue for at least sustaining, if not increasing, the number of language and area centers supported by the federal government.

The second concern in determining the total number of centers requires a departure from the current way of viewing them as undifferentiated programs all producing the same kind of students and the same kind of research product. We have argued for policies in the next stage of language and area studies to encourage a greater degree of specialization of centers so that the national profile of language and area studies covers languages, countries, disciplines, and topical domains that are critical to the national interest. This strategy would include both the addition of the specialized program segments on particular topical areas we mentioned above, as well as assuring that at least one center teaches each of the important least commonly taught languages or covers each of the countries or regions not covered by the other centers. Until this grid of nationally important domains of coverage is in place, how many centers it will take to ensure that coverage cannot be determined. Indeed, this report supplies only the beginning of a careful analysis of just what coverage is taking place now, let alone what it will be or should be in the next decade.

The third change that is essential in order to address rationally the question of the optimal number of centers is that we be much more rigorous in the criteria for extending federal support for students. In particular, we would add to the current criteria for center selection--now heavily weighted in terms of the size of the program and the disciplinary spread and research productivity of the faculty--a much closer look at the levels of language and area competency the centers actually produce in their students. We noted earlier the need for a higher level of general area competency in students and for greater proficiency in language. Centers should be judged on the basis of whether their students emerge with such skills--not just enrollments or requirements in the catalogue. What does a retrospective examination of a cross-section of students at the end of their training show? Once the nationally competitive tier of fellowships has been in place for a number of years, we will have a firm basis for making such judgments.

In making the criteria for federal support for centers more rigorous, we would also introduce a greater emphasis on the level of university support for the program. We have indicated earlier a number of objective ways this can be judged: tolerance for low-enrollment language and area courses; assistance in maintaining faculty representation in "difficult" disciplines and the least commonly taught languages; provision of substantial monies to help the collective activities of the center; maintenance of a high-level library collection. However, these objective criteria are not enough, and will have to be supplemented by impressions gained by site visit teams, a point we will return to in a moment.

In summary, the question of the appropriate number of federally supported language and area centers is as yet unanswerable. Moreover, it is our belief that the critical issue is not so much numbers as the adaptation of center activities to the demands of the next stage of language and area studies, and fitting them into a coherent national perspective on what the shape of our national resource base in language and area studies should be. With the changes we suggest in the conception of the role of centers--some degree of specialization and, added to the selection process, a rigorous evaluation of actual student training and of institutional commitment to the program--more rational decisions on the optimal number of different kinds of centers can be arrived at, and the service of centers to the national interest in general be can better assessed. We also believe that the institutional pressures we mentioned throughout the earlier sections of this report--particularly problems of assuring continued participation of hard social science and applied discipline specialists, and in some centers waning university support--are already having a winnowing effect. Indeed, the national problem may not be to contain the growth in the number of centers, but the danger that in the imminent contraction of our national resource base, key aspects of language and area coverage that are especially important to the national interest will be lost.

It is understandable, however, that hard decisions to restrict the total number of federally supported centers may have to be made on fiscal, not policy, grounds. If so, radical swings in federal support levels with very short lead times, as has unfortunately happened in the past, should be avoided. We believe that the total curtailment of all center support would have a disastrous effect on our national resource base in language and area studies. We do not think that the private foundations' policy of limiting support to one or two centers per world area, centers located almost exclusively in the major research universities, is an appropriate strategy for public support. Title VI has rightly provided for a greater regional distribution of centers throughout the United States, a greater variety of institutional contexts within which centers can operate, and more open opportunities for smaller programs to grow. This has made the national roots and the vitality of language and area studies much stronger than they would otherwise have been.

If an absolute number of centers to receive general support of the kind indicated earlier has to be adopted, then we would hope that it would be between the minimum of 4-6 programs per world area, a total of 46 centers--the lowest number ever of Title VI-supported programs, reached in 1973-74--and the present number of 76. This would provide a substantial enough base onto which the kinds of specializations we recommended above could be grafted, as well as assure that the general functions that centers perform for the nation could be continued.

Recommendation:
Decisions to change substantially the number of centers supported under Title VI should be postponed until the

role of centers is redefined; some degree of specialization is developed; criteria of national coverage can be applied; and more rigorous screening, including indications of the level of competency of students graduating from the program and institutional commitment, can be introduced. Any interim shifts in support should reduce the number no lower than the former lowest level of four to six programs per world area.

SELECTION AND MONITORING

Problem:
The present style of competition for Title VI centers is not suitable for specialized centers.

One of the strongest impressions of the survey grew out of our attempt to use the data provided in annual applications of centers for Title VI support. The match between what we read in the proposals and what we found on campuses was inexact. The current competition procedure results in a series of proposals that are of limited use in the selection process and of even less utility as a basis for planning. Programs are currently selected for Title VI support on the basis of the ability of a center director--and often a development office--to make, in a single proposal, a case that his center is bigger and better in all respects than the others in his area study group.

The selection of members for the review panels and the instructions given to them do not help to introduce a greater sense of reality into the process. No member of a currently funded Title VI center may serve on the selection committee, and those scholars who do sit on a committee are instructed not to allow any information they bring to the session outside of what is written in the proposals to enter into their judgment.

At the same time, the key monitoring staff in the Department of Education and the travel funds allocated to them to visit the centers have been severely cut, making it impossible for the departmental staff to do anything but the most cursory of proposal screening. We understand that in the near future, the program-monitoring function within the Department of Education will be even further removed from program administration, and will perhaps be decentralized into the Department of Education field offices, where monitoring will be the responsibility of individuals with little experience in international studies in higher education.

Moreover, there is no point in the process except the biennial competition where promise and performance can be measured. As a result, center competitions have tended to resemble entitlement programs.

This process has worked reasonably well for the growth stage of language and area studies, where distinctions of what should be supported in what kind of programs have not been the central issues. However, if federal support in the next stage is to be more targeted--if there is to be some genuine national planning based upon a cross-sectional, aggregate view of what is happening to the field--then the quality of reporting must be greatly improved. Without accurate information about the on-campus realities, the more closely targeted national strategy we believe to be essential for the next stage of language and area studies cannot be carried out.

And even in the selection of individual centers for public support--if the kind of criteria we have suggested above, including the extent of institutional commitment to the program, are going to inform the selection process--mailed applications without on-site visits to ascertain the health and vitality of a program will not suffice. Expanding the statistical data, making them more realistic, and storing them so that they are computer retrievable and manipulable will be helpful but not sufficient. Something resembling the practice currently in operation in the physical sciences--periodic site visits to federally supported centers by teams of distinguished experts--will be needed, as well as the revitalization and expansion of the in-house capacity of the administering agency to monitor centers' progress.

In addition, if realistic overall planning is to take place, the government ought either to establish a genuine capacity to maintain a series of accurate statistical data of the kind contained in this report, and to carry out evaluations--substantive as well as fiscal, in the manner of the General Accounting Office--and carefully targeted planning research; or it should contract this function out on a sustaining basis to an outside organization. How, and how well, this is done will be crucial to the next stage in shaping language and area studies closer to the national interest.

We realize that this will raise the overhead cost of administering the program, but the current procedure is wasteful and does not take full advantage of federal tax dollars in sustaining this important national resource.

Recommendation:
The center-monitoring process should be expanded, with sufficient staff who have experience in on-campus language and area centers and who are given sufficient travel funds to measure proposed activities against on-campus reality; to carry out regular and ad hoc evaluations; and to conduct pinpointed planning studies. This statistical evaluation and planning center can be either sustained in-house, or contracted out. If the latter, it is essential that the results of its work be closely tied to the policy process.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Problem:
A number of organizations at the national level serve various collective needs of one or another aspect of the field, but they are not included in any durable funding program that addresses the needs of language and area studies.

While most of the attention in funding programs intended for the promotion of language and area studies is aimed at campus-based centers, faculty, and students, there are a number of organizations operating at the national level that provide various kinds of services for the field as a whole. To our knowledge, what is needed for the growth and vitality of these national organizations has never been included in the planning for language and area studies, certainly not as a group. Each organization has pursued its individual purpose, seeking funds separately, annually, and often competitively. Nor has there been any careful mapping of their organizational space and functioning: who does what and how well, where the overlap is, what is missing, and how their individual and collective operations can be made more effective.

It had been our hope to undertake this kind of review, since we see the satisfactory functioning of many of these organizations as having an importance at least equal to that of many of the campus-based centers. We have collected a fair amount of descriptive information on a number of these national organizations, but the limited time available for our survey has not permitted the kind of serious study they deserve. We would urge that conducting such a review be given a high priority in the near future. This review should consider the area-related organizations as a whole, as well as in their individual capacities. All we can do here is to briefly categorize these national organizations, indicating roughly the important roles they play and how they relate to language and area studies.

We have already mentioned several types of organizations. One is the kind that establishes an American academic pied-a-terre in the country with which the scholarship is concerned, serving as a quasi-consulate, research facilitator, and general scholarly representative in that country. As an example of this genre, consider the largest and most extensive of them, the American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS). The AIIS operates in India on about $2 million worth of excess currency rupees annually. It runs a fellowship program for approximately 50 junior and senior American scholars each year; maintains a massive archive of photographs of temple architecture and another archive just begun on

Indian music; conducts conferences; has a publication series; and generally serves as a scholarly representative of the 35 American universities that are dues-paying members. It also arranges for research-topic and visa clearance by the Indian government and for the affiliation of a faculty member or student with an Indian university.

In scholarly and cultural connections with India, there is a rough organizational division of labor. The AIIS serves the South Asian language and area studies community, while Fulbright and another official exchange organization, the Indo-American Sub-Commission, serve other exchange needs. Most AIIS operating funds have been appropriated annually through the Smithsonian Institution, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and, for dollar costs, the Ford Foundation. The AIIS will face a desperate financial crisis within the next several years, as the excess rupee fund is about to be exhausted. The Smithsonian is trying to amass a forward fund to extend the period for which rupee funds will be available, but in the long term, the development of a more durable funding strategy is of vital interest to the field of South Asian studies and is surely in the national interest.

Other overseas institutes and centers like the AIIS, located in Greece, Italy (Rome), Turkey, Egypt, Yemen, Iran, and Hong Kong, have a less broadly defined mission and are less substantial in the size of their program and the scale of organization. At the lower end of the scale, for instance, there is what is almost a one-person organization operating in Yemen, and a remnant of an office is trying to survive quietly in Iran. As a whole, these organizations are not only valuable for American scholarly interests abroad, but also serve to maintain the vital network of transnational scholarly contacts that promote our national interest. In recognition of this importance, the Smithsonian Institution has helped to organize these overseas research centers into a coordinated group for planning and representation purposes, the Council of American Overseas Research Centers. The United States Information Agency (USIA), which over the years has provided occasional support, is considering requesting a line-item appropriation for them.

A similar but more limited set of overseas organizations are the overseas advanced language training centers. The most extensively organized of these are in Tokyo, Cairo, and Taipei, with other centers in India, Indonesia, Pakistan, and the Soviet Union. Most are managed by consortia of those American universities that have substantial language and area centers dealing with those countries. In addition to institutional membership dues and student fees, part of their funds come from the Fulbright-Hays portion allied to the Title VI administration, although for lack of specific mention in the authorization legislation for that program, they have to be funded at present under the general rubric of "group projects abroad."

As we have indicated throughout the report, these advanced language training programs are essential to language and area training, so that any planning for the next stage must include dependable funding to maintain them. Moreover, opportunities for such advanced study must be made available to more students and to the three largest programs in Cairo, Taipei, and Tokyo, which means either the creation of new centers or a major expansion of existing facilities. It is also clear, as we noted in Chapter 2, that the availability of such on-site language instruction must be extended to more countries as well.

While they have administrative offices in the United States, all of these organizations are essentially based abroad. They tend not to see themselves as having any responsibility for planning or influencing language and area activities in the United States. An exception is the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), which, unlike the others, is based in the U.S. and does see as one of its missions the development of Soviet and East European studies in the United States. While, like the AIIS, its primary function is to gather and regrant funds for overseas research and to secure the permission of the various governments for that research, it also arranges for some of the flow of scholars and students from abroad into American higher education. Moreover, it earmarks funds for particular purposes where, in its view, the field as a whole needs development.

The most recent of these initiatives by IREX is the creation of dual competency fellowships and lateral recruitment of mature scholars into the field of Soviet and East European studies. In part, its success in these ventures is a result of its close liaison with domestic language and area studies, including the Social Science Research Council/American Council of Learned Societies Joint Committees, which we will discuss below, and is tied to IREX's near-monopoly of overseas research access. Moreover, unlike some of the overseas-based organizations, its funds are in dollars and come from a mix of private foundations, individual donors, and U.S. and foreign governments, so that IREX has greater flexibility of action. Finally, IREX has a substantial staff, many of whom have been working for IREX for years. This staffing situation permits continuity in planning; furthermore, it enables the staff to spend a substantial amount of its time and effort on implementation of programs once they are initiated, a rarity in American academic organizations.

Two other national organizations within the Soviet and East European studies field that have no real parallel in the other world area groups are the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies and the National Council for Soviet and East European Research. The Kennan Institute, physically located within the Smithsonian Institution and affiliated with the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, is a center for research, publication, and scholarship. Its activities encompass a wide range of language and area research, drawing upon the resources of both American and foreign, including Soviet, scholars. Given its Washington location, the Kennan Institute attends to the interface between the academic and the governmental--both legislative and administrative--communities dealing with the Soviet Union.

The Wilson Center also maintains a fellowship program that enables American and visiting foreign Latin American and East Asian area specialists to reside for up to a year at the institution to carry out their research and writing, somewhat like the Palo Alto Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

It does seem to us that a useful addition to resources in the field would be to create more opportunities in a single place within the United States for scholars in all fields of language and area studies to devote a solid period of time to conducting and writing up their research, rather than in data collection forays overseas. In such a setting, scholars' work could be mutually stimulating, and they could establish highly durable and fruitful scholarly contacts across disciplinary and area lines. We might begin to move toward the interdisciplinarity that area studies has promised but delivered only to a very limited extent. Several years ago, there was a discussion of the possibility of establishing such a resident research facility at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. This idea, or a similar pan-area program added to an existing institute, like the one at the Smithsonian, would be highly useful for the future development of the field as a whole.

Another major national organization in Soviet and East European studies is the National Council for Soviet and East European Research. Funded by the Department of Defense and other government agencies, it provides project grants of the kind we proposed in Chapter 4, conducted on a medium-to-large scale by one or more researchers in the social sciences and focused on topics that have a public policy relevance broadly defined. The council, which is operated by a rotating academic board, appointed by university presidents, and chosen for its disciplinary and regional representation, sets in very broad terms its priority domains for research jointly with government specialists on the USSR and Eastern Europe. If the council's activities are to be maximally useful for the field, it too needs a funding perspective beyond a single year, and a funding level that permits it to continue to sponsor on a national scale the kinds of research with which it is concerned.

An equally important organization for China scholars is the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China (CSCPRC), under the joint sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Social Science Research Council. The CSCPRC is funded by U.S. government agencies, including the NSF, the USIA, the NEH, and the Department of Education, as well as by private foundations. It facilitates the exchange of American and Chinese delegations and offers opportunities for individuals in the sciences, engineering, social sciences, and humanities to conduct research in the People's Republic of China. In 1984, the CSCPRC has a program for American graduate students and postdoctoral scholars to carry out long-term study in affiliation with Chinese universities and is running a Distinguished Scholar Exchange Program. It is also conducting a comprehensive review of academic exchanges with China during the period 1978-83, analyzing data on the numbers and types of students and scholars sent by both countries, to assess the results and impact of the exchange programs.

None of these organizations sees itself as a general planning body for the language and area studies field as a whole. This role is occasionally undertaken by ad hoc or standing committees of the area studies professional associations: the African Studies Association (ASA), the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), the Association for Asian Studies (AAS), the Latin American Studies Association, and the Middle East Studies Association. They can and do issue recommendations for the field and carry out highly useful inquiries--witness, for instance, Warren Eason's "Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies," an AAASS project quoted throughout this report. However, these associations are basically individual membership organizations whose staff and financial resources are too limited to play a sustained role in providing guidance for the field. Moreover, like all membership associations where representativeness is a prime consideration, there are difficult problems of allocating and administering grant monies in a targeted fashion, and of long-range attention to implementing programs designed to supplement the normal laissez-faire drift of the field.

However, the area studies professional associations reach into the general body of language and area specialists in a fashion that the more selective and more tightly governed organizations cannot. They can, therefore, play an important role in communicating interests between the federal government and the dispersed international studies communities. They typically offer means for government needs and interests to become widely known in the scholarly community. Just as important, they can provide government with a pulse indicating how the scholarly community reacts to government initiatives in international studies.

The professional area associations play another role that can be considered both highly important and cost-effective. They often provide small grants for conferences of relatively small groups of scholars, such as the Vietnam Studies Group or the Burma Studies Group of the AAS. These small conferences help sustain scholarly interest and research on areas that are closed to foreign scholars. Thus, at very low cost, they maintain a national resource and arrest what otherwise might be a deterioration of scholarly resources on specific areas.

All of the organizations mentioned above tend to be focused on a single world area. There are a few organizations in the field that do have a more comprehensive coverage, but they tend to define their mission more broadly than language and area studies. For instance, in its early history, the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies (NCFLIS), the follow-up organization to the Presidential Commission in 1979, sponsored a major project to develop national manpower targets for all of the segments of language and area studies.[4] However, more recently, the NCFLIS has devoted its primary attention to a broader definition of international studies, to secondary and primary education, and to the diffusion of a more cosmopolitan understanding of world affairs in the public at large.

The Conference Board of Associated Research

Councils, an umbrella organization that represents the American academic community, consists of representatives from the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, and the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. The research interests of the Conference Board are obviously wider than the scope of the present report and it therefore does not consider itself a pan-area organization for language and area studies. However, it was the Conference Board that established the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars (CIES), a private organization that facilitates international exchange in higher education. Under a grant from the USIA, the CIES cooperates in the administration of the Fulbright Senior Scholar Program. The activities of the CIES extend to exchanges with a wide range of countries, but it is less involved with the development of the field of language and area studies on a domestic basis.

The one set of organizations that has, over many years, been concerned both with language and area studies in general, and with the development of the various area-specific fields within it, is the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), representing the social sciences and humanities respectively. In addition to their sponsorship of the CSCPRC, jointly with the National Academy of Sciences, and of IREX, and their appointment responsibilities for CIES, jointly with the NAS and the American Council on Education, the SSRC and ACLS engage area studies through their 11 Joint Area Committees, one for each of the principal world areas. SSRC/ACLS either jointly or individually also sponsor a variety of other activities relevant to the concern of this report, including cross-area research planning committees, overseas centers, an Area Assembly, and, in the past, such field maintenance projects as the three comprehensive earlier surveys of the field.[5]

The principal council agencies, however, are the 11 Joint Area Committees, which confine their concern to a particular world area. In recent years the Joint Area Committees, with funding from the NEH, the Ford Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and the Hewlett Foundation, have provided small grants for individual fellowships at the doctoral dissertation or the senior faculty level for work abroad. The Joint Area Committees also initiate and supervise numerous research planning and field definition projects, especially research conferences and workshops.

The Joint Area Committees have not had adequate funds to tend to the broad institutional aspects of the field, the general training of students, or the sponsorship of multi-year research projects--topics with which a good deal of this report has been concerned. Exceptions to this pattern, however, suggest the kind of general role that the Joint Area Committees could play, were funds available. For instance, the African Committee commissions state-of-the-art review papers that are used at plenary sessions at the annual ASA meetings; the Southeast Asian Committee has recently launched an ambitious research project on and with Indochinese refugees in the United States; the Japan Committee sponsors field surveys that serve the scholarly community and also funders in the United States and in Japan; and the Latin American Committee routinely co-sponsors projects with major research institutions based in Latin America. The Joint Area Committees, however, have generally not been able to sponsor large research projects or to take responsibility for continuous statistical series collection and the broad field evaluations necessary for the next stage of language and area studies.

The ACLS and SSRC are presently revising their governance structure in order to strengthen, at the Board level, attention to long-term field planning in area studies and foreign languages, in recognition that these tasks--for many years assumed by the International Division of the Ford Foundation--are not now being adequately performed.

In short, as in our review of the cross-section of federal agency funding for language and area research, we see a number of actors at the national organization level who are effective individually but whose collective activities leave important gaps in what we believe is necessary at the national level for the next stage in language and area studies. Once again, as in our discussion of the lack of fit between national needs and the narrow definitions of mission of the various government agencies, we can foresee the remedy of this situation as either expansion of the mission of existing organizations in the field, or the establishment of a new, overarching organization to perform the functions of integrating, reshaping, resource marshaling, record keeping, priority setting, planning, and evaluation, which we believe the stage beyond laissez-faire growth demands.

Recommendation:
A major review should be initiated to determine as precisely as possible what areas of redundancy and gaps there are in the collective needs of the field at the national or regional level. An overall strategy needs to be developed for assuring that these services are performed. Developing a substantial, durable source of funding for these organizations that fulfill essential overhead functions for the field is a high priority.

NOTES

[1] Edwin A. Deagle, A Survey of United States Institutions Engaged in International Relations Research and Related Activities: A Preliminary Report (New York: The Rockefeller Foundation International Relations Division, 1981).

[2] Agency for International Development, "Information Sheet on A.I.D. Joint Career Corps" (Washington, DC: Agency for International Development, 1983).

[3] Lorraine M. McDonnell, with Cathleen Stasz and Rodger Madison, Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients, prepared for the U.S. Department of Education (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983), p. 31.

[4] Allen H. Kassof, ed., "Report of the Task Force on National Manpower Targets for Advanced Research on Foreign Areas" (New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1981).

[5] See Chapter 1, p. 26, note 5, for the reference to the SSRC-sponsored reports on language and area studies.

6
Library and Information Resources

RESOURCE SHARING BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND UNIVERSITIES

Problem:
Except for the activities of the Library of Congress, there is almost no sharing of information storage and library resources across the academic/government divide.

This is an open moment for the design of patterns of sharing between the academic and government information systems, as well as among the major research libraries themselves. Rapid changes in the technology of information storage and retrieval are even now beginning to be introduced within each system, and now is the time to assure that in planning for the future, the special needs of area-related materials and personnel are built into these systems. In 10 years, the patterns will be well set, and area-related materials and specialist librarians will once again have to stretch an existing system to meet their needs only partially.

We know of no inventory of foreign material library collections, periodical subscriptions, or other regular information series maintained by the federal mission-oriented agencies, although we know that these materials exist and that many are quite comprehensive for the particular domains with which they deal. For instance, we were informed that the reference and serial collection on Africa in the Department of Agriculture is quite extensive, and that the Department of the Army library in Washington has a useful collection on foreign affairs.

We could find no information on what portion of these government collections and stored information is or could be unclassified, and what portion could be shared with the scholarly world on a regular basis. We were unable to ascertain how much of these collections is redundant with easily available external collections, or to discover who used what and how frequently, and how the problems common to all libraries and information storage systems were handled--for example, problems of staffing, acquisitions, cataloguing, quality control, storage, distribution, preservation, and the sharing of information on what is available where.

We were also unable to find any evidence of who within the mission-oriented agencies utilized the vast resources of campus-based collections on other countries, and the extent to which those in the mission-oriented agencies who might use the resources in these collections were even aware of the availability of this campus-based information.

We would suggest that a useful contribution to national planning for language and area studies would be to survey intra-government library and other information sources dealing with other parts of the world, relating these resources to equivalent resources and needs in the external research community--if such a survey does not now exist. Special attention should be paid in such a survey to ephemera--reports, documents, newspapers, press and broadcast digests--that tend not to be fully integrated into permanent library collections. From this survey should emerge recommendations on how to interlink the agency information gathering and storage systems more closely than they seem to be now. There will be types of information collection and storage where redundancy is desirable, and others where the national interest would be served by reducing duplication in collections and encouraging the sharing of information.

We note that since 1964 the Department of Commerce has made available all government reports, including daily foreign press and radio translations, and reports on any federally funded research project through its National Technical Information Service (NTIS). The NTIS bibliographic data for 1964-79 included approximately 750,000 items, and must now exceed 1 million items.

Currently, the primary link between the government and campus-based library systems is, of course, the Library of Congress, which comes as close to being a national library serving both public and private users as any institution in the United States. Not only does it serve as a domestic repository collection and maintain its own network of overseas acquisition and cataloguing centers, but its cataloguing services link it to all of the campus-based libraries with which we are concerned.

Over the years, the Library of Congress has been of immense help in building up our campus-based national resources for language and area studies. An example of the most extensive of such services has been the highly effective PL 480-supported program for the acquisition, cataloguing, and distribution to campus libraries of all materials published in South Asia, a program that meets a large proportion of the needs of campus-based South Asian area programs.

For other world areas, the Library of Congress provides other kinds of assistance--for instance, in cataloguing and maintaining repository collections of journals and newspapers. In some of the high-technology systems now being developed to assist libraries, such as MARC (Machine Readable Cataloguing) or video disk storage, only the Library of Congress has had the financial resources to bear the prolonged development and experimentation costs of perfecting these devices for general use.

As helpful as the current symbiotic relationship between campus-based libraries and the Library of Congress is, it has several drawbacks, not the least of which is that the well-being of campus-based resources is affected by fluctuations in the budget and priorities of the Library of Congress over which the campus-based libraries have no control. For instance, the surplus rupees that are now supporting the Library of Congress' extensive South Asian materials acquisition and cataloguing program will be exhausted in 1985. All of the South Asian studies programs that have been heavily dependent upon this program are now trying to find another source of funds and another mechanism for central acquisitions and processing to meet the coming crisis. Similarly, budgetary constraints have forced a reduction in the number of Library of Congress acquisition offices maintained overseas, and a curtailment in the domestic staffs for cataloguing foreign language materials. Given the limited financial resources available to South Asian studies centers, it is unlikely that many of them will be able to expand their own activities to cover this deficit completely.

In some areas, the current services of the Library of Congress are quite limited. For example, we were told that the cataloguing staff for African languages was very small relative to the substantial and increasing acquisitions from that area.

Not all services flow from the Library of Congress to the campuses. There are now numerous instances of reverse flows whereby activities either of individual campuses or of one or more of the national library organizations--for example, the Research Library Group (RLG), the On-Line Computerized Library Center (OCLC), and the Center for Research Libraries located in Chicago--carry out a substantial amount of coordination, planning, and program development that would normally fall to the Library of Congress, often providing services that under present circumstances cannot effectively be done there. For instance, some 25 libraries have agreed to do original cataloguing to Library of Congress specifications. Calls from the Library of Congress to campus-based libraries, especially for particular issues of newspapers and serials missing from its own collection, are not infrequent.

We believe that the topic of academic-government interaction--including the mission-oriented agencies as well as the Library of Congress--in relation to library resources and information acquisition, storage, and distribution is due for a highly focused inquiry leading to recommendations for making them maximally supportive. The Federal Library Committee, a separate entity housed in the Library of Congress, might be an appropriate place to begin this inquiry, since this committee recommends measures for the implementation of federal library policies and programs and serves as a forum for the communication of information among federal librarians and library users.

Recommendation:
A task force and survey team should be established to review the current status and the possibilities for future development of mutual support and interfacing between academic and government library and information storage systems.

ON-CAMPUS LIBRARY RESOURCES

Area studies programs cannot survive without adequate library resources. A great library collection does not of itself guarantee the excellence of an area studies program, but there can be no strong instructional or research program without one. Books are a capital investment. Unlike scientific equipment, which becomes obsolete in a few years, books tend to gain in value over time, and, with proper care, will outlast the buildings in which they are housed. Such considerations prompt language and area studies centers to devote a substantial amount of the discretionary funds available to them to building and maintaining library collections; similar considerations make great universities invest substantial sums of their own unrestricted resources in developing research-level library collections of materials relating to other parts of the world.

The area-related collections seem to be operating fairly smoothly for the universities and area studies groups, with some exceptions we will note. However, as with the center programs for teaching the uncommonly taught languages, clear storm warnings emerged from our discussions with area-related librarians, general library administrators, and leaders in the library field at the national level.

The Size of Area-Related Collections

The past several decades have seen immense growth in area-relevant library collections. We have no precise inventory of the dimensions and coverage of those holdings; such an inventory would be an immensely valuable contribution to national planning for language and area studies. While there have been segmental reports on collections dealing with particular world areas and/or particular problems, and a number (for instance, one on East Asian holdings) are under way, the last overall survey dealing with language and area studies in general was conducted in 1975,[1] and a great deal has happened since then.

The only available current, pan-area information on library holdings is the data in the proposals of the Title VI centers. While this includes most of the major campus-based collections relating to non-Western countries, the format for reporting and the nature of the responses are quite imprecise. Nonetheless, these data are summarized by Ann Schneider in her report of April 1982 for the Department of Education, "Libraries of Title VI Centers: Some Impressions and Some Questions." Schneider notes:

> The greatest library strengths [are] seemingly in Western European Studies, followed by East Asia, then USSR and Eastern Europe, and Latin America. Between this group and the remaining world areas (Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Africa) is a significant gap in averages.[2]

The data derived by Ann Schneider from the 1981-82 center proposals are admittedly imperfect, because no standard format was used by applicants in reporting on library holdings, acquisitions, and staff budgets. Even so, these data are still the most reliable estimates available at this time.

Table 6.1

Estimated Holdings of Title VI Center Libraries, 1981-82

	BOOKS IN ALL LANGUAGES		BOOKS IN LANGUAGES INDIGENOUS TO THE AREA	
	MEDIAN NO. OF VOLUMES	RANGES	MEDIAN NO. OF VOLUMES	RANGES
WORLD AREA				
AF	73,000	45,000-200,000	2,906	1,294-6,189
EA	294,000	121,600-683,000	248,000	54,000-737,000
EE	268,000	123,000-650,000	194,000	82,000-518,000
LA	228,000	32,000-711,000	140,000	16,000-286,000
ME	162,485	67,300-300,000	150,000	27,000-200,000
SA	130,000	125,000-199,000	86,000	41,000-106,000
SE	71,380	50,000-158,000	30,000	20,000-90,000

Source: These figures are derived from unpublished data provided by Ann I. Schneider, Department of Education.

Reproduced in Table 6.1 are the median holdings and range of holdings by centers for the various world areas. The median is more indicative than the range of what it really takes to have a good research collection. There is no "average" size collection, and the current size of holdings reflects the length of time a particular library has been assembling its collection, as well as its current rate of acquisition. Some institutions have been collecting materials related to a particular world area for many years, and others have been building library resources only over the past two decades. When the holdings of centers that are "joint" for Title VI purposes are reported as single entities, such as the

Berkeley-Stanford East Asia holdings, this tends to make the number of volumes somewhat higher than it is in any one center. The median is not affected by this inflation, although it does affect the range.

The Costs of Acquisitions and Staffing

The growth of these substantial collections has largely been the result of the efforts of individual libraries, which have spent immense amounts of their own time and money for this purpose. The proportion of the total costs paid by centers, while it has consumed a substantial part of the discretionary monies under their control, has in most cases been less than a third of the total funds spent by the library in acquisitions for their world area.

Table 6.2 shows the annual total costs for acquisitions spent by libraries on the collections relevant to the centers, and the amount and share of those costs borne by Title VI funds. The first two columns indicate for libraries at universities where Title VI centers are located the median and inter-institutional range of annual expenditures in 1981-82 for acquisition of all materials published in or dealing with the center's world area. The third and fourth columns present the median and the range of expenditures on library acquisitions in the same year from the Title VI portion of the centers' budgets. The final column presents the percentage of the median total acquisition expenditures borne by the center.

These figures are quite revealing about the nature of collection building with respect to the various world areas. The fact that, for South Asian studies, the PL 480 program covers almost all of the acquisition costs for books published in those countries means that the costs both to the library and to the center for additional acquisitions are quite small. Latin American studies acquisition costs are high for the library but relatively low for the centers, because libraries acquire their materials as part of their general intake of European language purchases. Acquisition costs in

Table 6.2

Expenditures of University and Title VI Funds by Title VI Centers on Library Acquisitions, 1981-82

	UNIVERSITY EXPENDITURES		TITLE VI EXPENDITURES		TITLE VI EXPENDITURES AS A % OF UNIVERSITY EXPENDITURES
	MEDIAN	RANGE	MEDIAN	RANGE	
WORLD AREA	$	$	$	$	%
AF	46,000	28,000-94,000	8,000	6,000-17,000	17.4
EA	120,000	20,000-230,000	21,000	6,000-36,000	17.5
EE	93,000	27,000-290,000	20,000	6,000-40,000	21.5
LA	105,000	27,200-320,000	11,000	5,000-22,000	10.5
ME	48,000	22,000-148,000	16,000	2,000-37,000	33.3
SA	17,000	9,500-37,000	4,000	3,000-8,000	23.5
SE	40,000	20,000-70,000	13,000	2,000-41,000	32.5

Source: These figures are derived from unpublished data provided by Ann I. Schneider, Department of Education.

general, and the expense to the center, are high in East Asian, Soviet and East European, and Middle Eastern studies, where problems of language difficulty and script are considerable, and where only through the efforts of the center would substantial investment in such collections be made. Overall, however, it is clear that the libraries, using largely unrestricted university monies, and not the centers bear most of the costs of acquisitions.

The relative role of the library and the centers becomes even clearer when one considers not just the cost of acquisitions but the salaries of the staffs needed to process these acquisitions. Table 6.3 presents some data relating to this matter. In the first column, the numerator indicates the number of centers in each area studies group that reported any expenditures for the library staff; the denominator indicates the total number of Title VI programs relating to that world area in 1981-82. The second column indicates, for those centers that do pay for library staff, what the median expenditure is, and the third column, what the range of expenditures is.

We have no data on total library staff costs borne by the institutions, and it is possible that some centers are using external funds other than Title VI to cover some of these costs. But the data in Table 6.3 suggest that for staff costs associated with these collections, it is the universities' general library budget that tends to foot the bill. And in many cases, the salaries reported by centers as spent on library staff are actually for bibliographers attached to the centers, rather than for processing staff the library uses more generally.

This is not to say that the acquisition and library staff costs do not eat up a substantial portion of the Title VI monies that centers have to spend. Adding together the acquisition and library staff expenditures that centers have to make, the average center spends 15.9% of Title VI center support monies on libraries; in East Asian, Southeast Asian, and Soviet and East European studies, the proportion is well over 20%. Thus,

Table 6.3

Expenditures of Title VI Funds on Library Staff by Title VI Centers, 1981-82

	CENTERS REPORTING EXPENDITURES ON LIBRARY STAFF/ # OF CENTERS IN WORLD AREA	MEDIAN	RANGE
WORLD AREA		$	$
AF	6/10	5,000	2,000-12,000
EA	8/15	11,000	3,000-41,000
EE	9/12	8,000	1,000-31,000
LA	5/11	4,000	1,000-11,000
ME	6/12	7,000	1,000-28,000
SA	5/8	6,000	2,000-19,000
SE	3/4	6,000	2,000-22,000

Note: Medians and ranges exclude centers which did not report expenditures on library staff.

Source: These figures are derived from unpublished data supplied by Ann I. Schneider, Department of Education.

library costs have to compete with instructional salaries, administrative costs, outreach, conferences, visitors, publications, travel--all of the other central activities of the program.

In short, while the universities bear the lion's share of library costs, the centers invest a substantial portion of their own monies in building up these collections.

The implications of these data are that if one is to plan for future development of area-relevant collections in the major universities, the deliberations must include the directors of the overall library as well as the centers, since it is by and large the expenditures of unrestricted university funds that are involved. These data also mean that if either the universities' commitment to sustain these collections or the Title VI support is withdrawn, it is our area-related national library resources that will suffer.

In addition to the concerns of the center and of the library administration, our inquiry has touched briefly on one other level of library affairs that is also crucial to the future of our national resources in foreign materials. As we will note below, much of the current activity most directly relevant for the future of area-related collections is taking place at the level of the national networks--particularly OCLC, which serves 3,700 libraries in North America, including a substantial number of those with which we are concerned, and the RLG's Research Library Informational Network (RLIN), which now includes 27 research libraries. These networks have been created by member libraries to help deal with their rising costs and shared problems of collection management. Many of the issues involving the area-related collections are ones that are or will be dealt with by the national network rather than at the level of the individual library. The RLG conspectus, which has permitted the RLG libraries to maximize their purchasing powers and to decrease redundancy, is now being used by the Association of Research Libraries as a tool to inventory the library resources of all major research libraries.

Our inquiry into the status of area-related library collections made it clear that the problems that were of most immediate concern varied by the interviewee's level in the library hierarchy. Only by putting these views together can an overall picture of the current state of our national resources emerge. Hence, the following discussion of the current state and future growth of campus-based area-relevant library collections will first deal with issues as they are viewed from three different levels: the center, the individual library, and the national network.

THE CENTER PERSPECTIVE

Staffing needs.

Problem:
Acquisitions has expanded without the requisite expansion of staff to service the collections.

The most frequently expressed concern of the area specialist librarians and bibliographers--although this varied somewhat by world area--was that while major collections have been assembled through the combined effort and funding of the universities, private donors, and federal agencies, almost all of the attention and funds have gone to acquisitions. There has been no comparable expansion in the number of specially trained librarians and bibliographers to manage these collections. Moreover, when financial pressures make reductions inevitable, every effort is made to maintain the flow of acquisitions while staff costs are reduced.

This is especially troublesome for the centers, since, as we have shown, their own funds tend to be tied up in support of acquisitions, while all or most of the staff costs are carried on library budgets. The centers' leverage is least where they feel the need is the greatest, and the on-again/off-again nature of Title VI has even more disastrous consequences for staffing than for acquisitions: except for serial publications, purchases can be postponed or curtailed, but staff costs are continuous and long term. Thus, centers have difficulty using their funding as leverage for long-term staffing commitments by the library.

This problem seems to be serious and widespread enough to justify a special effort to expand the specialized library staff available to the centers, and to do so in a targeted, long-term fashion that will make expanded staffing possible. There is not enough slack in the monies currently available to centers to accomplish this purpose, and financially pressed libraries are unlikely to be able to respond to this need without outside help.

It is not enough just to increase the number of staff members attached to the area-related collections. It is also important that the professionalization of the area specialist librarian or bibliographer, a process already under way, should continue. Library and information management is becoming too technical a field to be grafted onto a language and area competency by on-the-job experience. A recent report by the Joint Advisory Committee to the East Asian Library Programs expressed concern about the qualifications of those currently emerging from the major library schools, with particular reference to those trained to handle East Asian collections.[3] Much the same point can be made for the other area studies groups.

A pivotal investment for the field would be the development of a satisfactory training mix of language and area competency and technical library and information management skills. Once such a curriculum is developed, specially earmarked fellowships should be set aside for students training to be area-related librarians. One bonus from such an investment would be the amelioration of what has been a persistent problem in the field: because of a lack of technical competencies, area specialist librarians have sometimes been isolated within their own libraries and certainly within national library activities.

Recommendation:
Specially earmarked funds for library staff salaries should be added to current Title VI allocations to centers.

Together with a national organization such as the Council on Library Resources, area studies librarians should develop a curriculum for new or supplemental training to upgrade their skills and to learn the new information technologies that are becoming increasingly important for research universities.

Backlog of foreign language materials.

Problem:
The normal processes of cataloguing new acquisitions create time lags and gaps in the availability of area-relevant materials, particularly those in the languages indigenous to the various regions.

A second problem often expressed in interviews with area specialist librarians was the extent to which important books or serials acquired by individual libraries or by the Library of Congress either were processed very slowly, or were never catalogued at all. This was especially true of books and serials in the less commonly taught languages. The feeling frequently expressed was that the central processing mechanisms that handled most acquisitions satisfactorily left as an unattended residue a substantial portion of the works language and area scholars were concerned with. Virtually all major research libraries manage to make their backlogs available to their own faculty via minimal cataloguing--author, title, place of publication, and date--but in very few instances is this information made available to other potential users.

No one knows how large this backlog is; how important the uncatalogued items are to the core area-related collection of either an individual library or the national library collection; and how many of the titles would require minimal or full cataloguing. However, even in the absence of precise figures, references to these cataloguing gaps were frequent enough to justify a special effort to reduce at least the most important portion of this backlog.

In the long run, of course, the ideal solution is to improve the central cataloguing process so that this backlog is removed and does not reaccumulate. In the short run, it might be useful to develop one or more supplemental cataloguing strategies, utilizing the special language and area competencies dispersed throughout the centers. Suggestions that were made include 1) a shared cost system of cataloguing through the Library of Congress, in which a university library would get a fixed reimbursement for unique additions to the general catalogue repository; 2) an equivalent system managed through one or both of the major library networks, OCLC or RLIN; 3) expanding the specialized library staff at one or a few campus-based centers to handle such materials; 4) exchange of xerographic reproductions of title pages to selected topical or disciplinary specialists; and 5) itinerant cataloguers who would regularly visit libraries to manage the cataloguing of those area-related materials that were most difficult to deal with under normal handling procedures.

Recommendation:
Pilot projects should be launched to determine the nature and the scale of cataloguing lags and gaps, and the best method or combination of methods to reduce them both retrospectively and prospectively.

Special costs of acquiring foreign language materials.

Problem:
As in cataloguing, there are special difficulties in area-related acquisitions that the current general library acquisition strategies are not adequately handling.

The third general concern of center librarians has to do with acquisitions, not so much the general level of acquisitions--since, as we have seen, acquisition policy and costs were borne on most campuses by the central library administration--but the special problems of acquisitions abroad, particularly in the developing countries, where book buying and bibliographic control were less systematic. In particular, area librarians were worried about being able to sustain their visits abroad to make targeted purchases supplementing the normal acquisition strategies of libraries. It was felt that the difference between a top-quality research library collection and one sufficient only for generalized teaching purposes depended heavily on these supplemental purchases. With the proposed reduction in overseas representation by the Library of Congress, this concern was enhanced; in the case of South Asian studies, the prospect is for imminent catastrophe, since none of the programs has had to set up its own comprehensive collection system for several decades.

The problem of overseas acquisitions is a prime candidate for collaborative and combined acquisition strategies to be developed by centers working in conjunction with their libraries. In the long run, these strategies should be carried out in collaboration with institutions in the countries as well.

One useful suggestion made to us was that a mechanism be set up on a pilot basis in one or more of the Latin American countries for bibliographic control and improved acquisitions, especially for governmental and academic publications. This might be established as a collaborative international project by U.S. and Latin American members of SALALM (Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials). Such a mechanism would not only reduce the expense of acquisition trips for the major U.S. research libraries, but would also put into place a structure that could be used advantageously by all interested university libraries in this country--and to some extent by Latin American libraries as well. The professional competency in Latin American library science circles has now developed to a level to make this feasible in a number of places, and if it could be brought off successfully, the project could resolve one of the major hindrances to collection development for that world area. The model would lend itself to other parts of the world as well. The highly effective Library of Congress acquisition and cataloguing program in New Delhi is another model, one whose imminent demise should be viewed with considerable alarm.

Recommendation:
Each area studies group should explore the special problems of acquisitions as they relate to the countries with which they are concerned, and draw up collective plans for ensuring the flow of acquisitions, particular-

ly those such as government and academic publications that tend to escape the normal acquisition process.

THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATOR'S VIEW

Problem:
Area-related collections present special problems, both in their growing size and in processing and management costs. At the same time, they are too marginal to the general collection, and their utilization rates are too low, to justify continued expansion of uncommitted university resources for them.

While the area librarians and center directors are concerned with supplementing the current staffing, cataloguing, and acquisition policy with respect to the area-related collections, the librarians and university administrators responsible for library budgets whom we interviewed are concerned about their ability to continue their current activities with respect to these collections.

In a way, these specialized collections are in the same position as instruction in the uncommonly taught languages: they are important to the center's functioning, but marginal to the university's primary concerns; they are high-cost items, but they have relatively low utilization rates; while there is a fairly constant flow of some external monies to cover some of the costs of the collection, the vast majority of the expense is met from general university revenues. Hence, area-relevant library expenditures are natural and highly visible candidates for curtailment when institutional resources become constrained. Moreover, since they lie at the margin of the overall concerns of libraries and library associations, it is natural that some of the special problems of language- and area-relevant collections are not fully met.

The argument that the universities and the libraries spend far more on works related to the United States and Europe is not persuasive. With seemingly geometrical increases in acquisition costs, with quantum jumps in the number of books and serials being published in many countries, and with a rapidly expanding area collection's relative drain on general library resources, including shelf space, more and more librarians see trouble ahead. They recall that, with the help of foundation and federal funding, there was a rapid build-up of collections when the area programs first expanded. Since then, acquisition levels have fluctuated wildly with the availability of federal funds, and unrestricted university funds have not been available in the amounts required to replace declining federal support. The precarious nature of Title VI support has been especially damaging to a sustained acquisition policy.

Librarians also feel that the area center faculty and the area-focused bibliographers have not exercised enough uniform quality control to keep collection growth in check and, thus, to make processing requirements realistic. There is the added feeling that the growth trajectories envisaged by many area centers have led to too much redundancy in collecting, and that coordinated policies for area-relevant acquisitions are too slow in developing.

As in the case of scarce language instruction, ominous storm clouds are gathering at the universities with respect to the maintenance and continued expansion of area-related library collections. While the system seems to be working fairly well at the present time, it would be well to anticipate some of the problems that will inevitably occur in the near future. Again, as in the case of area and language instruction, our national resource may be dangerously weakened by having the same marginal retrenchment decisions made on every campus at the same time.

Recommendation:
A major review of problems with the area-related collections should be made, but from the perspective of the universities and general librarians in addition to the specialists attached to those collections.

THE NATIONAL VIEW

A strategy for collaboration and complementarity of resources.

Problem:
Redundancy in area-related collections, coupled with rising costs and increases in the volume of materials to be acquired and stored, make it urgent that plans be developed for complementarity and shared resources among universities.

Most of the concerns discussed above are shared by all libraries, not limited to area-related collections. The central problem for language and area studies as well as for libraries as a whole is well stated in a recent publication of the RLG

> RLG is founded on the recognition that neither significant increases in library purchasing power nor reductions in demand for library services are likely in the foreseeable future, that the volume of information on which modern scholarship depends will continue to grow, and that in decades ahead, individual collections, regardless of their size and history, will be forced to move increasingly away from comprehensive acquisition policies.
>
> The creation of RLG is an effort by research universities and independent research libraries to manage the transition from locally self-sufficient and independently comprehensive collections to a nationwide system of interdependence that will preserve and enhance our national capacity for research in all fields of knowledge and improve our ability to locate and retrieve relevant information.[4]

A similar statement of aims could be presented from publications of the other major national library network, OCLC.

The custodians of area-related collections must realize the impossibility of continuing with the current practice of building each collection as if it were the only such collection in the country. A strategy for collaboration and a movement toward complementarity and efficient transport of needed materials among libraries are vital to their survival, particularly in view of what we have outlined above: area-related collections' marginality to the general university collections; the immense expansion in the materials necessary for a good research collection; and the fact that the bulk of the costs are being met from general university revenues. Past efforts in this direction have not included all area studies groups and have not gone far enough. It is essential that discussions on rationalization and complementarity among area-related collections make progress in the near future, and this should be a precondition to any substantial increase in support for these collections.

Fortunately, there has been considerable progress on problems of information sharing and complementarity at the national level of library management, the library network. All of the libraries of which the research-level area-related collections are a part participate in at least one of these networks. In a number of cases, area specialist librarians have been directly involved in creating the facilities for information sharing and bibliographic control among member institutions.

It is essential that all the area studies groups participate in the consideration of the problems affecting their collections. As in the case of centralized cataloguing, the special problems of area-related collections, particularly where difficult languages are involved, call for special attention. Moreover, the geographic spread of area centers within the United States, plus problems of even more widely dispersed need for access to the few research-level collections, call for special solutions. A contribution to realistic discussion would be tabulations on the extent, nature, and geographic spread of the use of the various area-related collections. Such tabulations would at least help indicate which materials are of sufficient general use that all major collections should have them, and which ones are largely of an archival nature, stored for possible future use. They might also help to determine how wide the geographic area of collaboration might be.

Recommendation:
Language and area specialists must participate actively in the ongoing efforts of the national library networks to develop mechanisms for a division of labor and collaboration in the development of collections; and they must make their own supplemental plans. To these ends, a special task force ought to be created within each area studies group to engage in such planning. Preceding that planning, a number of studies of patterns of use of the collections should be undertaken.

In addition to this general problem of rationalization and reducing redundancy in collections, the national-level library associations have been grappling with a number of problems that face libraries in general but have special relevance to area-related collections.

Adapting non-Roman scripts to the computerized network.

Problem:
The problems of computer management of non-Roman scripts must be solved before full inclusion of area-related collections in the current bibliographic and shared cataloguing arrangements can be assured.

The national library networks have made a great deal of progress in creating data bases and systems of on-line computer storage of bibliographic information; shared cataloguing responsibilities; finding which libraries have which publications; and accessing those materials through interlibrary loans or photo-reproduction. To assure that area-relevant collections can take full advantage of these facilities, the adaptation of non-Roman scripts to computer storage, referencing, and transmission must first be accomplished. Some of the area studies groups have already been involved in such efforts. For instance, a committee of representatives of East Asian libraries has assisted the RLG in developing a system for including in the computerized network of catalogued titles materials in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean ideographs. OCLC has recently demonstrated a similar system. An extension of this process to Arabic and some of the South Asian scripts is a natural next step.

Recommendation:
Those area studies groups where the indigenous languages use a non-Roman script should work with the national library networks to adapt those scripts so that they can be entered into the general computerized bibliographic and information-sharing facilities.

Inventory of existing overseas bibliographic services and data bases.

Problem:
While one of the most promising developments in cooperative information storage and retrieval is the combination of bibliographic information with access to ongoing data bases, a systematic review of overseas sources that might be added to such computer accessed systems has not been made.

In today's world, where a flood, not a dearth, of information is the problem facing the researcher, the tools that introduce order into bibliographic searches--for instance, the ability to make a rapid search for publications by topic--are an invaluable addition to the national catalogues of publications issued in each country. When to these is added the ability to tap into not just published books and journals but data bases, the value of such systems is enhanced even further.

The national library networks are developing just such systems, but as yet, those interested in area-related collections have not addressed the issue as to whether there are similar combinations of bibliographic search and data base access that might serve their needs. Moreover, as more and more countries develop their own bibliographic and data base *facilities*--for instance, the National Ethnographic Library at Kyoto, Japan, or the possible movement of some of the responsibility for the human relations area files to that country--this matter of systematic and ordered information importation will become increasingly important for language and area specialists.

Recommendation:
Language and area specialists should conduct an inventory of existing bibliographic services and data bases with reference to the countries of their specialization, with an eye toward including them in existing library network facilities.

Preservation of materials.

Problem:
Materials in the collections are already deteriorating or are in danger of deterioration. A strategy for systematic preservation must be devised.

The national library networks have begun to devote concerted attention to the physical deterioration of materials in their collections. This very general problem facing libraries is of special importance to those concerned with area-related collections. Particularly in books and periodicals published in developing countries, the quality of the paper and binding is so poor (for instance, the acid content of the paper is uniformly too high) that the shelf life of the work is quite short. Substantial portions of area-related collections that were acquired at considerable expense are deteriorating on the shelves. In some cases, the paper is so poor that libraries refuse to bind them.

The best current answer to this problem is reproduction of these works by microphotography. But while there are some programs of joint distribution of microfilms among area studies groups, the only large-scale ongoing programs we are aware of to convert substantial collections to microfilm are confined to American materials. The preservation of the materials in their collections should be one of the primary concerns of language and area specialists.

Recommendation:
Funds and efforts should be marshaled by the language and area studies centers to develop, in collaboration with the national library organizations, a phased plan to begin the process of preserving existing materials in the area-relevant collections that are in danger of deterioration.

Monitoring our national library and information resources.

Problem:
Efforts scattered throughout the language and area community and directed at some or all of these problems will be maximally productive only if they are coordinated and fitted into an overall plan for the next development stage for language and area studies.

Central to any process of development with respect to area-related library collections is not just the funds to allow these problems to be faced, but the creation of an inter-institutional monitoring process that makes dispersed activities cumulative rather than duplicative. In a final parallel to our national resources for teaching the scarce languages, the national interest is only partly served by attending to the adequacy of the collection in a particular institution. Of at least equal interest is what the decisions and events in individual institutions mean for the national cross-sectional area-related library resources. Unless our resource base is constantly reviewed from this perspective, once again an accumulation of the same decisions made on every campus may result in an imbalance in our national stock of materials.

Thus, for the library aspects of area studies, an intensive review of the status of resources--acquisitions, processing, preservation, access--should take place every three years. The review should involve the strongest representatives of the scholarly and the library worlds, directors of libraries as well as subject specialists, and should work from a few commissioned studies done competently and precisely. Not all possible topics would have to be touched on each time, but the sessions would help set standards for performance that are intellectually sound and fiscally and administratively responsible.

Recommendation:
To monitor progress in the various problem areas and to help coordinate effort, a central monitoring and coordinating facility should be created. It would include not only representatives of the various area studies groups, but those in charge of libraries as a whole and representatives of the major national library organizations.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

So that the language and area studies centers can play a constructive role at the margin of general library policy, funds will have to be made available to them to be spent on:

1. Additional staff for processing and bibliographic work shared between the center and the library.

2. Specialized and supplemental acquisitions, particularly that carried out overseas.

3. An expanded contribution to the general library fund at the center's institution for acquisition and processing costs of area-related materials.

4. Cataloguing, both retrospectively and ongoing, of materials likely to be missed in the centralized, standardized cataloguing process.

5. Development of a plan and a strategy for reducing collection redundancy and increasing inter-collection sharing of resources.

6. Extending the on-line bibliographic retrieval and data storage systems to include area-relevant materials, particularly those in non-Roman scripts.

7. Working to preserve the materials already acquired through microfilming or other techniques.

8. Monitoring our national library and information resources.

Continuity of funding is as important as level, since many of these problems will be with us for some time. Not all of these activities should take place at the level of the individual center, nor be funded through them, but centers should band together to bring collective funding and their own point of view to the discourse to assure that their interests are served. Their advocacy role should not be limited to their own institutions.

NOTES

[1] Library Resources for International Education. A Report submitted by the Task Force on Library and Information Resources to the Government/Academic Interface Committee, International Education Project, American Council on Education (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1975).

[2] Ann I. Schneider, "Libraries of Title VI Centers: Some Impressions and Some Questions" (Washington, DC: Department of Education, 1982), p. 2.

[3] Automation, Cooperation, and Scholarship: East Asian Libraries in the 1980's (n.p.: Automated Library Information System, 1981).

[4] *RLG in Brief* (Stanford: The Research Libraries Group, Inc., 1983), p. 2.

7
Conclusions

To summarize the points raised in the foregoing discussion, we herewith extract the statement of the problems uncovered in the course of the investigation and the recommendations for solving those problems. They are presented under the headings utilized in the text so that the full discussion on each of these points can be referred to.

SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 2: Language Competency

TWO SYSTEMS OF INSTRUCTION

Problem:
Two parallel systems of instruction in the uncommonly taught languages have grown up, one within the government agencies and one on the campuses. While they serve somewhat different purposes and do so within different institutional contexts, they can be mutually supportive. There are no established mechanisms for sharing problems and solutions.

Recommendation:
A series of national conferences of government and academic language teachers should be convened on an annual

basis for each of the major language families. Their purpose would be to share information about problems, pedagogical technology, and materials. The hosts would be the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable on the government side, and on the academic side one or more of the national organizations, such as the Center for Applied Linguistics, the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages, or the Modern Language Association, and the professional organizations of the teachers of each language.

SUSTAINING EXISTING NATIONAL RESOURCES

Problem:
The cost of teaching low-density languages is increasingly difficult to justify in traditional adminisrative budgetary terms. The basic reason for high costs is small and decentralized demand for instruction by students who require high-level language skills for research and other purposes. Some coverage of all languages is needed.

Recommendation:
A supplemental national support program should be devised to assure the continuation of our capacity to teach the least commonly taught languages on our campuses. Some Title VI funds should be specifically earmarked for this purpose instead of coming out of the 16% of general center support currently allocated for language instruction. Each major center receiving support should be required to cover at a minimum one of the least commonly taught languages relating to its area, with careful attention to complementarity both within the program and nationally. In addition, partially supported posts to sustain instruction in languages that are judged to be critical to the national interest would be open to national competition; be subject to sharing with an institution or set of institutions; and be contingent upon the development of a national cooperative plan for the maintenance and sharing of instruction in the least commonly taught languages for each area studies group.

We would, however, postpone expansion into new languages until some of the issues discussed below are dealt with.

AREA STUDY GROUP DIFFERENCES

Problem:
The needs, resources, and problems of instruction in the various languages are quite different. Hence, any next-stage planning must be tailored to the special needs of each area group. Simultaneous attention to all languages is not practical.

Recommendation:
Experimental programs for upgrading campus-based language instruction should begin with Japanese, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic.

A COMMON METRIC OF LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Problem:
In the academic training system, there is now no standardized way of measuring an individual's language skills. This impedes efficient articulation across the levels of training and certification of an individual's skill level. Furthermore, the differential effectiveness of pedagogical styles and teaching materials cannot be established.

Recommendation:
A major effort should be undertaken, within both the Department of Defense and the campus-based teaching systems for the less commonly taught languages, to develop a common, proficiency-based metric. These efforts should be carried on in a parallel fashion within the various teaching establishments to ensure their maximal applicability to the particular needs of each institution and language. But efforts should be coordinated on the government side by a committee of the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable, and on the academic side by existing coordinating institutions and organizations such as the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages, the Center for Applied Linguistics, and the area-

specific language teaching organizations where expertise can be assembled. In addition, special efforts must be made to assure the widespread use of existing tests and those to be developed. Once these measures are adopted, basic research on the effectiveness of various teaching strategies needs to be encouraged.

RAISING LEVELS OF LANGUAGE COMPETENCY

Problem:
High-level competency in the less commonly taught languages is difficult to achieve and maintain, and the number of Americans who have done so is too small. The competency of many presumed language and area specialists is inadequate. Too many students are graduating with too low a level of language competency.

Recommendation:
The next stage of development in language and area studies should include specific measures to raise the general standard of language competencies throughout the field, and, in the case of the best students, provide both the time and the facilities for truly advanced language competencies to be acquired. As a goal, all students accepted for the most advanced language and area training should show by performance on a standard proficiency test a minimal level 2 proficiency. For some area studies groups, this may require an interim transitional stage to allow time for approaching that norm, but goals should be set now.

Continuous and more extensive funding should be provided to support existing overseas advanced language training centers, and to enable more students to attend them. An effort should be made to establish such facilities in world areas where they do not now exist.

A collaborative effort involving both academic and government language teachers should be launched to develop satisfactory teaching technologies for raising listening and speaking proficiency to the higher skill levels.

SERVING DIVERSE CLIENTELES

Problem:
Too little is known about ways in which language learning styles and needs of individuals are best matched with pedagogical approaches. It is fairly certain that the format and timing of present campus-based instruction is optimal for only a limited group of learners, mainly initial learners.

Recommendation:
A major collaborative effort involving both the academic and the government language teaching worlds should be launched to conduct the necessary basic research and to develop satisfactory programs to maintain, reinforce, restore, and upgrade the language competencies of the existing cadre of language and area specialists.

Funds should be allocated for research, experimentation, and initial program development to make available instruction in the less commonly taught languages to a geographically dispersed clientele, to learners other than degree-seeking students.

IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATION AND FUNDING

Problem:
Pluralistic efforts to deal with the achievement of high-level language proficiency and coverage of languages can achieve only limited results.

Recommendation:
Support is recommended to establish a set of special language instruction resource centers to stimulate and coordinate innovative work in language teaching.

THE LACK OF FUNDING

Problem:
Those funds necessary to carry out many of the tasks indicated above are currently not available anywhere in the federal government or among the private foundations.

Recommendation:
A federal fund should be created that is specifically charged with the support of research and program development in language pedagogy. This fund can be channeled through existing organizations, but the efforts of these organizations must be coordinated so that a coherent policy serving the national interest can be devised and implemented. Should the current definitions of mission of the existing agencies make this impossible, a new, centrally administered fund must be created.

RECAPITULATION--AN ACTION PLAN FOR LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY

1) Develop a common metric that is language performance-oriented and calibrated for all levels of fluency. Equally important is encouraging the adoption of this common metric on as wide a basis as possible on campuses, throughout the government, and by other employers.

2) Give special emphasis to the achievement of more advanced skills--oral as well as written--than is commonly the case now. This task calls for the establishment of new norms of acceptable language competency in those area studies groups in which they are currently low; for the creation of new pedagogical styles and learning situations that emphasize higher-level skills; and for longer-term fellowship programs that make it possible for students to acquire those skills.

3) Supplement the existing campus-based organizational style for language instruction. This task will include an increased use of intensive year-long, semester, or summer courses in which only language skills are taught; the creation of teaching facilities and materials to deal with language skill maintenance and upgrading for the existing stock of specialists; the development of the capacity to teach students who cannot reside physically at major centers of language instruction or who need to proceed at their own pace; and the creation of learning opportunities for those other than regular students who need to learn a language outside the normal academic format.

4) Create a series of campus-based language teaching resource centers, linked to a central coordinating body. This network will assemble technical resources; conduct basic and applied research; help prepare and evaluate teaching materials and approaches; train teachers; administer tests needed for accrediting students and teachers; conduct prototype intensive language instruction programs; and maintain a capacity to provide, on demand, instruction in the least commonly taught languages not available elsewhere. It will also act as liaison between the campus-based efforts and those of the Department of Defense and other government and private language teaching enterprises.

5) Provide the financial resources necessary to conduct sustained research and experimentation in language pedagogy. A special fund should be established either within an existing granting program or as a distinct funding program.

Chapter 3: Area Competency

AREALITY IN TRAINING

Problem:
Area training has been too heavily concentrated in the disciplinary departments, so that students becoming area specialists cannot develop broad perspectives or professional skills as components of their expertise.

Recommendation:
Area training should include a substantial amount of area-specific work in the discipline in which a student is specializing, plus supplemental area-specific work in other disciplines outside the major, and either classical or modern training, depending on which period complements the primary emphasis.

SPECIAL COST OF TRAINING

Problem:
The need for experience overseas and the breadth and long duration of training mean that students training to become area specialists need more money to complete their training than non-area-oriented students.

Recommendation:
The amount of support to graduate students in area studies should reflect the special requirements of their training. It should include sufficient funds for a mid-training sojourn in the area; advanced language training in the country where the language is spoken; a sojourn to carry out dissertation research; a period of time to write up research findings; and post-doctoral research.

Funds for the first two or three years of training should be provided through centers; thereafter, funds should be awarded through national competitions. In the national competitions, language proficiency and general area knowledge will be rewarded. Nationally competitive awards should be portable and should carry with them appropriate institutional fees.

DISCIPLINARY IMBALANCES

Problem:
The disciplinary distribution of specialists and students training to be specialists is skewed. Specialists tend to be underrepresented in the social sciences--especially economics, sociology, and psychology--and in the applied disciplines that may be most directly relevant to public policy. The conditions underlying these imbalances are self-perpetuating.

Recommendation:
To assure at least replacement of the present stock of specialists with scarce disciplinary-area skill combinations, a set of apprenticeship fellowships should be put at the disposal of eminent scholars for students wishing to enter these specialties. These mentors should be selected by distinguished national panels. The students

in turn would be selected from a national pool of applicants by these mentors. As in the case of the advanced fellowships described in the previous section, these apprentice fellowships would be of four years' duration, flexible and portable--at the discretion of the mentors--both domestically and abroad, and would carry appropriate institutional fees.

To expand the corps of specialists, established scholars should be enabled to acquire language and area skills or new country competencies, as in the International Research and Exchanges Board dual-competency program. For newly trained specialists within applied or professional disciplinary fields, sufficient resources should be invested to allow for the acquisition of both a fully developed disciplinary or technical skill, and a high degree of language and area competency.

EFFECTIVE DEMAND AND NATIONAL NEED FOR SPECIALISTS

Problem:
Effective demand for area specialists in terms of job opportunities is decreasing, at the same time that the national need for high-quality specialists continues.

Recommendation:
The number of fellowships for new entrants into the field should be reduced and made highly selective. The savings from this reduction, plus any additional resources necessary, should be used for the establishment of the proposed nationally competitive, longer-term, portable, flexible fellowship, and for the fellowships specially earmarked for missing or endangered components in the national resource base.

A pressing agenda for the field is to explore ways to bring national need and effective demand into closer agreement.

Chapter 4: Research

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESEARCH

Problem:
Research aims on the campus are too limited. Scholars do not expect to be able to obtain funding for large-scale, collaborative, multi-year projects; they therefore tend not to think of their own research in these terms and do not pursue funding beyond that necessary to cover their own salary and possible travel costs.

Recommendation:
To encourage the development of the larger-scale, longer-term research that would draw in a number of faculty members and help to train students, Title VI should be amended to include a small research fund for each center to cover the early phases of major project generation, and support for students to gain experience in research apprenticeships. In addition, more funding for larger-scale research should be made available and more faculty members should be apprised of the strategy of applying for and administering major grants.

ACADEMIC COVERAGE OF THE RESEARCH PRODUCT

Problem:
Left to the unconstrained preferences of scholars, research coverage--in either geographic or disciplinary terms or both--has important gaps.

Recommendation:
An organization or organizations should be identified and a procedure established to monitor the cross-sectional research product of language and area studies; to identify countries and topics that the laissez-faire selection of research topics has missed; and to disperse and administer funds to fill in those gaps.

POLICY RELEVANCE AND UTILIZATION OF THE RESEARCH PRODUCT

Problem:
There are important substantive domains and types of research with a direct relevance to national policy decisions that are not getting enough attention from language and area specialists, nor are federal agencies disposed to use the research that is produced.

Recommendation:
The organization(s) given responsibility for monitoring and supplementing the general substantive coverage of research by language and area studies specialists should be charged with special attention to and funding for policy-relevant research. This research, while remaining basic or contextual in nature, will address some of the broad policy issues facing the nation. In the meantime, Part B of Title VI should be extended to include basic research relevant to the general policy interests of American business abroad.

FUNDING AGENCY COVERAGE OF RESEARCH

Problem:
The narrowly focused missions of the various government research funding agencies are responsible, in part, for the imbalances and lacunae in the research product.

Recommendation:
Funds should be provided to encourage research on topics that are currently not receiving attention. Three research domains of high priority are 1) large- and medium-scale collaborative research in both the social sciences and the humanities; 2) research on broadly defined policy-relevant topics; and 3) research relating to language teaching in the less commonly taught languages. Support can be channeled through existing organizations, like the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Department of Education, the Department of State, or the Smithsonian Institution, but with funds clearly earmarked and awarded in special competitions. Title VI should be amended if necessary to permit the provision of a small general

fund to each center, to be used for project development.

If the current pattern of agency granting of research funds is continued, then a central organization monitoring the effects of funding patterns on the cross-section of the research product should be created. If serious imbalances and gaps persist, a separate endowment to provide funds for international research should be created.

ACCESS TO OVERSEAS RESEARCH SITES

Problem:
Despite the existence of a durable network of transnational scholarly contacts, access to research sites has become increasingly difficult to negotiate in many countries, and in some countries, the sponsorship of research by the Department of Defense may make access impossible.

Recommendation:
A major review should be undertaken of the obstacles to research access in other countries, with a view to establishing bilateral mutual agreements to counter the deteriorating situation.

Direct Department of Defense funding of overseas research should be done with great care and openness, and should be confined to those countries and situations where scholarly access to research sites will not as a consequence be threatened.

Chapter 5: Campus-Based and National Organizations

CAMPUS-BASED CENTERS

Problem:
Federal funding under Title VI has provided crucial flexible support for the collective activities of campus-based language and area studies programs. But the effectiveness of this support has been eroded by

inflation, by the brevity of the grant cycle, by shifting selection criteria based on policy swings within the Department of Education, and by periodic efforts to abolish the program.

Recommendation:
A general, flexible support program, such as that contained in the current Title VI program, should be continued, since it is essential for the well-being of the field. A major criterion in the provision of such federal support should be evidence of a strong and continuing university commitment.

Center support should be on a five-year cycle, with staggered competitions, to allow adding to or deleting from the existing pool of federally supported centers in interim years.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN CENTER SUPPORT

Problem:
The laissez-faire system of program support under Title VI has served well the growth stage of language and area studies, but does not encourage the building of new strengths in substantive domains of great national importance.

Recommendation:
A number of supplemental centers or center segments should be established via national competition, to focus their research and teaching on relatively neglected aspects in the internal development of language and area studies, such as 1) language pedagogy; 2) the special demands of successful undergraduate education for nonspecialists; and 3) policy-relevant issues of special concern to business and to the mission-oriented federal agencies. For the latter purposes, funding from those agencies should be provided.

THE NUMBER OF CENTERS

Problem:
At the present time, there is no rational basis, other than the amount of money appropriated, to determine how many centers the federal government should support.

Recommendation:
Decisions to change substantially the number of centers supported under Title VI should be postponed until the role of centers is redefined; some degree of specialization is developed; criteria of national coverage can be applied; and more rigorous screening, including indications of the level of competency of students graduating from the program and institutional commitment, can be introduced. Any interim shifts in support should reduce the number no lower than the former lowest level of four to six programs per world area.

SELECTION AND MONITORING

Problem:
The present style of competition for Title VI centers is not suitable for specialized centers.

Recommendation:
The center-monitoring process should be expanded, with sufficient staff who have experience in on-campus language and area centers and who are given sufficient travel funds to measure proposed activities against on-campus reality; to carry out regular and ad hoc evaluations; and to conduct pinpointed planning studies. This statistical evaluation and planning center can be either sustained in-house, or contracted out. If the latter, it is essential that the results of its work be closely tied to the policy process.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Problem:
A number of organizations at the national level serve various collective needs of one or another aspect of the

field, but they are not included in any durable funding program that addresses the needs of language and area studies.

Recommendation:
A major review should be initiated to determine as precisely as possible what areas of redundancy and gaps there are in the collective needs of the field at the national or regional level. An overall strategy needs to be developed for assuring that these services are performed. Developing a substantial, durable source of funding for these organizations that fulfill essential overhead functions for the field is a high priority.

Chapter 6: Library and Information Services

RESOURCE SHARING BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND UNIVERSITIES

Problem:
Except for the activities of the Library of Congress, there is almost no sharing of information storage and library resources across the academic/government divide.

Recommendation:
A task force and survey team should be established to review the current status and the possibilities for future development of mutual support and interfacing between academic and government library and information storage systems.

THE CENTER PERSPECTIVE

Staffing Needs.

Problem:
Acquisitions has expanded without the requisite expansion of staff to service the collections.

Recommendation:
Specially earmarked funds for library staff salaries should be added to current Title VI allocations to

centers.

Together with a national organization such as the Council on Library Resources, area studies librarians should develop a curriculum for new or supplemental training to upgrade their skills and to learn the new information technologies that are becoming increasingly important for research universities.

Backlog of Foreign Language Materials.

Problem:
The normal processes of cataloguing new acquisitions create time lags and gaps in the availability of area-relevant materials, particularly those in the languages indigenous to the various regions.

Recommendation:
Pilot projects should be launched to determine the nature and the scale of cataloguing lags and gaps, and the best method or combination of methods to reduce them both retrospectively and prospectively.

Special Costs of Acquiring Foreign Language Materials.

Problem:
As in cataloguing, there are special difficulties in area-related acquisitions that the current general library acquisition strategies are not adequately handling.

Recommendation:
Each area studies group should explore the special problems of acquisitions as they relate to the countries with which they are concerned, and draw up collective plans for ensuring the flow of acquisitions, particularly those such as government and academic publications that tend to escape the normal acquisition process.

THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATOR'S VIEW

Problem:
Area-related collections present special problems, both

in their growing size and in processing and management costs. At the same time, they are too marginal to the general collection, and their utilization rates are too low, to justify continued expansion of uncommitted university resources for them.

Recommendation:
A major review of problems with the area-related collections should be made, but from the perspective of the universities and general librarians in addition to the specialists attached to those collections.

THE NATIONAL VIEW

A Strategy for Collaboration and Complementarity of Resources.

Problem:
Redundancy in area-related collections, coupled with rising costs and increases in the volume of materials to be acquired and stored, make it urgent that plans be developed for complementarity and shared resources among universities.

Recommendation:
Language and area specialists must participate actively in the ongoing efforts of the national library networks to develop mechanisms for a division of labor and collaboration in the development of collections; and they must make their own supplemental plans. To these ends, a special task force ought to be created within each area studies group to engage in such planning. Preceding that planning, a number of studies of patterns of use of the collections should be undertaken.

Adapting Non-Roman Scripts to the Computerized Network.

Problem:
The problems of computer management of non-Roman scripts must be solved before full inclusion of area-related collections in the current bibliographic and shared cataloguing arrangements can be assured.

Recommendation:
Those area studies groups where the indigenous languages use a non-Roman script should work with the national library networks to adapt those scripts so that they can be entered into the general computerized bibliographic and information-sharing facilities.

Inventory of Existing Overseas Bibliographic Services and Data Bases.

Problem:
While one of the most promising developments in cooperative information storage and retrieval is the combination of bibliographic information with access to ongoing data bases, a systematic review of overseas sources that might be added to such computer accessed systems has not been made.

Recommendation:
Language and area specialists should conduct an inventory of existing bibliographic services and data bases with reference to the countries of their specialization, with an eye toward including them in existing library network facilities.

Preservation of Materials.

Problem:
Materials in the collections are already deteriorating or are in danger of deterioration. A strategy for systematic preservation must be devised.

Recommendation:
Funds and efforts should be marshaled by the language and area studies centers to develop, in collaboration with the national library organizations, a phased plan to begin the process of preserving existing materials in the area-relevant collections that are in danger of deterioration.

Monitoring Our National Library and Information Resources.

Problem:
Efforts scattered throughout the language and area community and directed at some or all of these problems will be maximally productive only if they are coordinated and fitted into an overall plan for the next development stage for language and area studies.

Recommendation:
To monitor progress in the various problem areas and to help coordinate effort, a central monitoring and coordinating facility should be created. It would include not only representatives of the various area studies groups, but those in charge of libraries as a whole and representatives of the major national library organizations.

FUNDING

This report's recommendations for new programs or modification of existing programs call for a relatively small amount of additional funding. Indeed, they present a low-cost. high-leverage strategy that will both secure the existing national resources in language and area studies built up at such great expense, and enable them to reach more fully the national interest goals originally set for them: to train high-quality students to an advanced level of language and area competency, and to produce a systematic body of knowledge on other countries to inform our educational system, the public, and the makers of our national policy.

In the letter transmitting this report to the Department of Defense, we have recommended that it play a direct role in funding the supplemental programs having to do with improving instruction in the less commonly taught languages, with the enhancement of library resources, and with the expansion of support for research, mainly in Soviet, West European, and East Asian studies. The recommendations in those sections of the report, as well as those in other sections, are addressed to other federal agencies as well, and to the private foundations, many of which are already providing some support in one or another of these areas.

Considered as a whole, these individual recommendations add up to an integrated, internally consistent strategy for the next stage of language and area studies. Piecemeal, crablike movement is not likely to bring about the major transformation herein recommended, particularly if there is no collective planning, intelligent allocation of resources, and effective monitoring of the progress of the field. Accordingly, a more durable, dependable, and integrated federal funding strategy must be developed for the support of our national resource base in language and area studies. The individual missions of the various governmental agencies responsible for funding education and research do not collectively cover all the essential parts of language and area studies. Moreover, the swings in funding levels applied for and granted under the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) and the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title VI have made long-range planning for language and area studies quite difficult. Whatever the ultimate level of funding, without an integrated, long-term strategy for support of the various aspects of language and area studies, this resource base is unlikely to fully serve the national interest, and will even slip away.

The time has come, therefore, to consider the creation of a central funding and administering body for language and area studies, and perhaps for other aspects of international studies. Such a body might be a separate endowment or foundation, paralleling the National Science Foundation and the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, or it might be appended to one of the existing governmental agencies. The Smithsonian Institution, with its mix of public and private funding and of domestic and overseas activities, is an especially attractive possibility. The growing international activities of the U.S. government should properly be called upon to provide some of the funds for such an endowment. In particular, in addition to earmarked annual appropriations from relevant agencies or directly from Congress, such a body should be supported by a share of monies flowing back into the U.S. Treasury from foreign loan repayments or from sales of military and other equipment abroad. In the private sector, the body should be eligible to receive some of the non-repatriatable profits held overseas by American business. The special purpose of the body would be to sustain our domestic and overseas investment in cosmopolitanizing our educational system and our society.

The report of the Advisory Board on International Education Programs in the Department of Education recently made a similar recommendation:

> A National Fund for International Education should be created. This Fund should receive a portion of the reflow funds generated by the overseas sale of U.S. Government military and other properties, and by interest payments on overseas technical assistance loans. In order to encourage contributions abroad from U.S. firms unable to repatriate profits, U.S. tax deductions should be permitted on contributions made to the Fund abroad by their foreign subsidiaries.[1]

We concur with this recommendation.

MONITORING

In addition to fuller, more coordinated funding, the next stage of language and area studies clearly calls for a better-monitored process of support than has been characteristic of the last several decades. So long as laissez-faire growth was appropriate, the current information system worked reasonably well, but this is not enough for the future growth of the field. The kinds of new programs outlined above call for a regular flow of detailed information on the cross-sectional nature of the field--the collective results of the decisions being made on individual campuses, and the ability to monitor and evaluate ongoing programs much more closely than can be done at present. We are not encouraged by the apparent decline in the monitoring capacity for the Title VI program within the Department of Education, and, moreover, our review indicates that many more aspects of language and area studies are now interfacing with government support programs that themselves require intensive monitoring and evaluation.

It is important to establish an independent monitoring, evaluation, and planning facility for language and area studies as a whole and for the federal programs that help sustain it. Such a facility would maintain the regular statistical series that are useful for planning and for the allocation of resources called for in many of the programs outlined above. It would also regularly administer the peer reviews of operating programs needed to supplement the written application and reporting materials that are now the sole source of information on their success. It would have the capacity to carry out ad hoc planning studies and evaluations as required. Such an evaluation and monitoring facility may operate on a contract basis from one or more of the federal agencies centrally concerned with language and area studies. Although its reporting should be responsive to public policy needs, it should stand administratively outside those agencies. Indeed, a mix of public and private support would enable the monitoring organization to serve the national interest more broadly.

****

What has been presented is a long and complex agenda. It is time to get on with it.

NOTE

[1] Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action (Washington, DC: Department of Education, December 1983), p. 10.

Appendices

A
Glossary

AAASS	American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies
AAS	Association for Asian Studies
ACLS	American Council of Learned Societies
ACTFL	American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages
AF	Africa
AID	Agency for International Development
AIIS	American Institute of Indian Studies
ASA	African Studies Association
ASTP	Army Specialized Training Program
CAL	Center for Applied Linguistics
CASA	Center for Arabic Study Abroad
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIES	Council for the International Exchange of Scholars

CSCPRC	Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China
DLI	Defense Language Institute (Department of Defense)
DOD	Department of Defense
EA	East Asia
EE	Eastern Europe and Soviet Union
FALCON	Full-Year Asian Language Concentration Programs (Cornell University)
FIPSE	Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education
FLAS	Foreign Language and Area Studies (Fellowship)
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
HEA	Higher Education Act
IA	Inner Asia
IEA	International Education Act
IREX	International Research and Exchanges Board
LA	Latin America
LASA	Latin American Studies Association
LASR	*Language and Area Studies Review*
MARC	Machine Readable Cataloguing
ME	Middle East
MESA	Middle East Studies Association
MLA	Modern Language Association

NASILP	National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs
NCFLIS	National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies
NEH	National Endowment for the Humanities
NSA	National Security Agency
NSF	National Science Foundation
NTIS	National Technical Information Service (Department of Commerce)
OCLC	On-Line Computerized Library Center
RLG	Research Library Group
RLIN	Research Library Information Network (Research Library Group)
SA	South Asia
SALALM	Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials
SE	Southeast Asia
SEASSI	Southeast Asian Studies Summer Institute
SSRC	Social Science Research Council
TAMBSPI	Teacher-Assisted Mastery-Based Self-Paced Instruction
USIA	United States Information Agency
WE	Western Europe

B
Methodology

SITE VISITS

An interview team visited twenty campuses as well as several government and private language teaching facilities. The interview team consisted of Dr. Elinor G. Barber of the Institute of International Education, Dr. Eleanor Jorden of Cornell University, and Dr. Leon I. Twarog of Ohio State University. Dr. William Bader of SRI International joined the team for two site visits. On each campus visit, the interview team met with central university and school administrators, the directors, faculty and graduate students associated with language and area studies centers, and the area specialist librarians.

The campuses visited (see Table B.1 for a list) provided a wide range of language and area studies programs in both public and private universities, although the study's Congressional mandate to report on advanced research and training limited the selection to the major research universities. Hence, campuses with large and well-organized programs tended to be chosen for a visit, and in this way over 50% of all the centers supported by Title VI were covered. On each campus, however, programs of very different size and degree of organization, not all of them Title VI centers, were encountered. Since the purpose of the campus visits was not to take a representative cross-sectional polling where exact proportions would be important (these were left to the objective information on which representative cross-sectional data were available) but to look for varieties of situations and opinions, this sampling method worked fairly well. After the first dozen or so visits, the general pattern and its variants that we were looking for emerged very clearly.

Most campus visits lasted two days. In all, the site visit team met as a group with approximately thirty-five university administrators; more than fifty center directors, three hundred faculty members; and about one hundred and fifty students.

In addition to these collective interviews, Elinor Barber met with groups of faculty who were engaged in research on various world areas, and chairmen of social science departments who may or may not have been connected with the centers. Leon Twarog met with library administrators and area bibliographers and cataloguers. He and Eleanor Jorden interviewed chairmen and faculty of the appropriate language departments. William Bader accompanied the group to supplement the coverage of West European and policy-relevant aspects of our study. Aside from administrators and faculty, each member of the team met with a number of students at different stages of graduate study: some at the Master's level, others preparing to go abroad to do research, and some in the write-up stage of their dissertations.

ANALYSIS OF APPLICATIONS FOR TITLE VI SUPPORT

Two aspects of the applications submitted to the Department of Education by language and area studies centers for Title VI support were analyzed: 1) faculty publications from 1976-81, and 2) information on changes between 1976-82 in courses, enrollments, and faculty at Title VI centers.

In order to produce the cross-sectional view of the research profile of faculty of language and area studies centers presented in Appendix F, we coded the publications of the center faculty over a five-year period (1976-81). This publication survey included 72 out of the 76 language and area studies centers supported by Title VI in 1981. In that year, there were 91 Title VI centers, but the twelve International Studies centers, the two Canadian Studies centers, and the one Pacific Island Studies center were beyond the scope of this project and were not analyzed. For the purposes of our survey, we counted joint Title VI centers as two individual centers. Since there were eight joint centers in 1981, this means that there were a total of 84 language and area centers when the joint programs are counted separately; of these 84 centers, we coded the publications of 80. See the column, "Centers With Publications Coded, 1976-81," in Tables B.2 and B.3 for the list of centers included in our publication survey.

There are two ways in which world areas are referred to in tables in this report: 1) the activities of centers are related to the world area category to which a center is assigned under Title VI, even if some of those activities spill over into other world areas, and 2) in the tabulation of publications, the world area referred to relates to the country or world area of a book or article, no matter what the Title VI category of the center to which the author belongs. Thus, in the tables relating to centers, the reference to world area categories represents the classification used by the Department of Education for Title VI language and area centers. These world area study groups are referred to by two-letter abbreviations in our tables: AF = Africa; EA = East Asia; EE = Eastern Europe and the USSR; IA = Inner Asia; LA = Latin America; ME = the Middle East; SA = South Asia; SE = Southeast Asia; and WE = Western Europe. For an example of this use of world area as a Title VI category, see the two-letter abbreviations under "World Area" in the first column of Table B.2.

In the analyses of publications, on the other hand, world areas are referred to as actual geographical territories. In these cases, the names of countries, regions, or world areas are spelled out in full. All the tables in Appendix F, which present the research profile of Title VI faculty for 1976-81, are based on the geographical focus of the publication, not Title VI center affiliation of the author, and therefore no world area abbreviations are used in this appendix.

For each center in our publication survey, we coded any articles or books written by professors, assistant professors, lecturers, and librarians. We did not code the publications of research associates, visiting professors, or people who did no teaching for a center.

Each publication was coded for its geographical focus; the title was used to determine which world area, country, or sub-national region the publication was about. Out of a total of 7,265 publications coded, 5,952, or 81.93%, were in specific reference to a world area or country. The remainder represent books and articles written by center faculty that had, for our purposes, no "areality"--that is, they were general works about no particular country or region. The 5,952 area-specific books and articles, then, provide the statistics in each of the tables dealing with publications, and this total is used as the denominator in calculating the percent of works on a given area or topic.

Each publication was also coded for its topic--that is, the title of a publication was used to determine the discipline to which a book or article belonged. In addition, the major disciplines (anthropology, sociology, arts, economics, geography, history, language and linguistics, literature, religion and philosophy, political science, and miscellaneous topics) were divided into subcategories reflecting the major topical divisions within each field. An article or book could be double-coded for two topics, e.g., it could be coded as being about both economics and political science. Each publication was also coded for its policy relevance. See the discussion of Table 4.3 in Chapter 4 for an analysis of the categories of policy relevance.

In order to assess changes over time in enrollments and in the disciplinary spread of faculty expertise at Title VI centers, we analyzed the changes from 1976-82 in the number of faculty and courses in a sample of Title VI centers. Our sample consisted of thirty-nine centers; only those centers for which we had both 1976 and 1982 applications could be included in this part of our analysis. The column labeled "Analysis of Title VI Applications, 1976, 1982," in Tables B.2 and B.3 refers to our analysis of certain changes over time in Title VI centers.

In the analysis of Title VI applications, we divided faculty into "core" and "non-core" categories. Any faculty member who was reported as devoting more than 25% of his time to center activities (teaching and research on the area) was counted as "core." We then determined how many core faculty were in each discipline. We made the same kind of tabulation of area-related and language course enrollments. A course had to have the name of a geographical area in its title in order to be counted as an area-relevant course. In other words, a "Survey of East Asian Civilization" was counted as an area course, whereas "World Food Policy" was not. A course had to have an enrollment to be counted in our survey; courses "offered" that had no enrollments were not included. The results of these analyses of Title VI applications are presented in Tables 2.1, 3.5, 5.2, and 5.3.

ANALYSIS OF TRAINING OF APPLICANTS FOR TITLE VI DISSERTATION YEAR FELLOWSHIPS

To take a retrospective look at the full training pattern of language and area students, with the assistance of the Department of Education staff and with all marks identifying individual institutions and students removed, the transcripts of the 344 students who applied in 1983 for Fulbright Title VI dissertation year fellowships to conduct research abroad in the 1984 academic year were analyzed.

The transcripts were divided into the appropriate Title VI world area categories, according to the world area on which the student had done most of his coursework and/or on where he was applying to do research abroad. To determine how area-related a student's training was, any graduate courses he took which were about a world area--based on a reference in the title of the course to a geographical region--were tabulated. Separate records were kept of the number of these area courses that were within and outside his major discipline. Each student's graduate language coursework was also examined to determine the highest year of graduate language instruction reached. It is important to note that only graduate-level coursework was included in our tabulations so that the language training of a student who took all of his language coursework as an undergraduate would not show up in our tabulations. Native speakers, of course, would also be tabulated as having no language training at the graduate level.

Table 3.6 shows the degree to which the training of these students is bound by the disciplines, and the variation of area-related training among the disciplines. Table 2.4 presents the highest level of language training during graduate study of all 344 applicants.

OTHER UNPUBLISHED SOURCES OF DATA

The project also had access to data from the following organizations:

The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies made available for the first time special computer runs from Warren Eason's "Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States."

The Council on International Exchange of Scholars provided information on the grants awarded under the Fulbright program from 1971-84.

The Department of Education provided us with data compiled from Title VI applications.

The Modern Language Association provided us with detailed data on language enrollments in the United States in 1980.

The Rand Corporation provided us with special runs of the data used in its 1983 report, Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients.

The Rockefeller Foundation did a further analysis of the data from the 1981 report by Edwin A. Deagle, A Survey of United States Institutions Engaged in International Relations Research and Related Activities: A Preliminary Report.

SRI International, under a subcontract with the Association of American Universities, made an analysis of the DOD needs for language and area expertise, "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe."

Data on funding patterns of research by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Institute of Mental Health were also made available to us.

Table B.1

Site Visits Completed By Research Team

Brigham Young University

University of California, Berkeley

University of California, Los Angeles

University of Chicago

Columbia University

Georgetown University

Harvard University

Howard University

University of Illinois, Urbana

Indiana University

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Princeton University

Rockland Community College, N.Y.

SAIS, The Johns Hopkins University

Stanford University

University of Texas, Austin

University of Utah, Salt Lake City

University of Washington, Seattle

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Yale University

TOTAL: 20 campus visits

In addition, the site visit team visited the Defense Language Institute, the Foreign Service Institute, and the Mormon Missionary Language Training Center.

Table B.2

Research Sample Size For Title VI Centers, 1981-82

	TITLE VI CENTERS WITH PUBLICATIONS CODED, 1976-81	ANALYSIS OF TITLE VI APPLICATIONS 1976, 1982	TOTAL NUMBER OF CENTERS IN 1981
WORLD AREA			
AF	10	4	10
EA	16	7	16
EE	10	6	12
IA	1	1	1
LA	16	6	16
ME	13	5	13
SA	8	6	8
SE	4	3	4
WE	2	1	4
TOTALS	80	39	84

Note: In this table, joint centers are counted as two individual centers.

Table B.3

Research Sample Size For Title VI Centers, 1981-82 in Detail

	CENTERS WITH TITLE VI PUBLICATIONS CODED, 1976-81	COMPARISON/ ANALYSIS OF TITLE VI APPLICATIONS 1976, 1982	CAMPUS VISITS
TITLE VI CENTERS		AFRICA	
Boston U	X		
UC Berkeley	X		X
UCLA	X	X	X
Florida, U	X		
Howard U	X		X
Illinois, U	X	X	X
Indiana U	X		X
Michigan State U	X		
Stanford U	X	X	X
Wisconsin, U	X	X	X
TOTALS	10	4	7

Table B.3 (continued)

	CENTERS WITH TITLE VI PUBLICATIONS CODED, 1976-81	COMPARISON/ ANALYSIS OF TITLE VI APPLICATIONS 1976, 1982	CAMPUS VISITS
TITLE VI CENTERS	EAST ASIA		
UC Berkeley	X	X	X
Columbia U	X	X	X
Cornell U	X		
Hawaii, U	X		
Harvard U	X	X	X
Illinois, U	X		X
Indiana U	X		X
Kansas, U	X		
Michigan, U	X		X
Ohio State U	X		
Pittsburgh, U	X		
Princeton U	X	X	X
Stanford U	X	X	X
Virginia, U	X		
Washington, U	X	X	X
Yale U	X	X	X
TOTALS	16	7	10
	EASTERN EUROPE & USSR		
UC Berkeley	X		X
Columbia U	X	X	X
Harvard U	X		X
Illinois, U	X	X	X
Indiana U	X	X	X
Kansas, U	X		X
Michigan, U	X	X	X
Ohio State U	X	X	
Oregon, U			
Virginia, U			
Washington, U	X	X	X
Yale U	X		X
TOTALS	10	6	9

Table B.3 (continued)

	CENTERS WITH TITLE VI PUBLICATIONS CODED, 1976-81	COMPARISON/ ANALYSIS OF TITLE VI APPLICATIONS 1976, 1982	CAMPUS VISITS
TITLE VI CENTERS	INNER ASIA		
Indiana U	X	X	X
TOTALS	1	1	1
	LATIN AMERICA		
UC Berkeley	X		X
UCLA	X	X	X
Chicago, U	X	X	X
Connecticut, U	X		
Florida, U	X		
Florida International U	X		
Illinois, U	X	X	X
New Mexico, U	X		
New Mexico State U	X		
Pittsburgh, U	X		
San Diego State U	X		
Stanford U	X	X	X
Texas, U	X	X	X
Tulane U	X		
Wisconsin, U	X		X
Yale U	X	X	X
TOTALS	16	6	8

Table B.3 (continued)

	CENTERS WITH TITLE VI PUBLICATIONS CODED, 1976-81	COMPARISON/ ANALYSIS OF TITLE VI APPLICATIONS 1976, 1982	CAMPUS VISITS
TITLE VI CENTERS	MIDDLE EAST		
Arizona, U	X		
UC Berkley	X		X
UCLA	X		X
Chicago, U	X	X	X
Harvard U	X		X
Michigan, U	X	X	X
New York U	X		
Ohio State U	X		
Pennsylvania, U	X		
Princeton U	X		X
Texas, U	X	X	X
Utah, U	X	X	X
Washington, U	X	X	X
TOTALS	13	5	9
	SOUTH ASIA		
UC Berkeley	X		X
Chicago, U	X	X	X
Columbia U	X	X	X
Pennsylvania, U	X	X	
Texas, U	X	X	X
Virginia, U	X		
Washington, U	X	X	X
Wisconsin, U	X		X
TOTALS	8	5	6

Table B.3 (continued)

	CENTERS WITH TITLE VI PUBLICATIONS CODED, 1976-81	COMPARISON/ ANALYSIS OF TITLE VI APPLICATIONS 1976, 1982	CAMPUS VISITS
TITLE VI CENTERS	SOUTHEAST ASIA		
Cornell U	X	X	
Hawaii, U	X		
Michigan, U	X	X	X
Wisconsin, U	X	X	X
TOTALS	4	3	2
	WESTERN EUROPE		
City U, New York	X		
Columbia U	X		X
Indiana U			X
Minnesota, U			
TOTALS	2	0	2

C
ASTP Language and Area Programs

Institutions with ASTP Language and Area Programs

UNIVERSITY OR COLLEGE	LANGUAGES								
Amherst C.	FR	GM	SP	IT					
Bard C.	FR	GM							
Boston C.	FR	GM	SP						
Boston U.	FR	GM		IT					
U.C. Berkeley		GM		IT	RU	CH	JA	SC	TH
U.C.L.A.		GM		IT		CH			
Carleton C.	FR	GM							
Carnegie Institute of Tech.	FR	GM	SP						
U. of Chicago	FR	GM		IT	RU	CH	JA		
U. of Cincinnati	FR	GM	SP						
Clark U.		GM		IT					GK
C.C.N.Y.	FR	GM	SP	IT	RU				
Cornell U.		GM		IT	RU	CH			CZ

Source: Kurt E. Müller, "National Security and Language Competence: U.S. Armed Forces and Transnational Communication (Master's thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 1983), pp. 120-23.

Appendix C (continued)

UNIVERSITY OR COLLEGE	LANGUAGES										
U. of Denver	FR	GM					JA		BU	HU	
Fordham U.	FR	GM	SP	IT							
Georgetown U.	FR	GM	SP	IT	RU	CH	JA				
Grinnell C.		GM	SP	IT							
Hamilton C.	FR	GM									
Harvard U.		GM			RU	CH	JA				
Haverford C.		GM		IT							
U. of Idaho	FR	GM			RU						
U. of Illinois	FR	GM	SP	IT							
Indiana U.		GM			RU	GK	BU	SC	HU	PL	TU
U. of Iowa		GM		IT					CZ		
Johns Hopkins	FR	GM		IT							
Kenyon C.	FR	GM									
Lafayette C.	FR	GM	SP	IT							
Lehigh U.	FR	GM									
U. of Maryland	FR	GM	SP								
Michigan S.C.	FR	GM	SP	IT							
U. of Michigan	FR	GM	SP	IT			JA			PE	
U. of Minnesota		GM					JA	FI	NO	SW	
U. of Missouri		GM		IT	RU						
U. of Nebraska		GM									
N.Y.U.	FR	GM			RU						
U. of North Carolina	FR	GM	SP	IT							
Ohio S.U.		GM	SP	IT							
Oregon S.C.	FR	GM	SP		RU	CH					
U. of Oregon			SP	IT	RU				NO	PT	
U. of Penn.		GM			RU	CH			AR	BE	HI
U. of Pittsburgh		GM			RU				SC	GK	
Pomona C.	FR		SP			CH	JA				
Princeton U.	FR	GM	SP	IT					AR		TU

Appendix C (continued)

UNIVERSITY OR COLLEGE	LANGUAGES									
Queens C.	FR	GM	SP							
Rutgers U.	FR	GM	SP	IT						
St. Louis U.		GM		IT						
Stanford U.	FR	GM	SP	IT	RU	CH	JA	DU	MA	
Syracuse U.	FR	GM	SP		RU					
U. of Utah		GM		IT			JA			
Vanderbilt U.	FR	GM								
U. of Washington						CH	JA		KO	
Washington U.		GM		IT						
U. of Wisconsin		GM	SP	IT	RU			NO	PT	PL
U. of Wyoming	FR	GM	SP							
Yale				IT	RU	CH	JA	BR	MA	

Language Abbreviations

AR -- Arabic (dialect unspecified)
BE -- Bengali
BR -- Burmese
BU -- Bulgarian
CH -- Chinese (Mandarin assumed, Fukienese also taught)
CZ -- Czechoslovak
DU -- Dutch
FI -- Finnish
FR -- French
GK -- Greek
GM -- German
HI -- Hindustani
HU -- Hungarian
IT -- Italian
JA -- Japanese
KO -- Korean
MA -- Malay
NO -- Norwegian
PE -- Persian
PL -- Polish
PT -- Portuguese (Brazilian assumed)
RU -- Russian
SC -- Serbo Croatian
SP -- Spanish (American)
SW -- Swedish
TH -- Thai
TU -- Turkish

D

Languages Taught in Academic and Government Institutions, by World Area

The information on languages taught in government agencies is taken from John L. D. Clark and Dora E. Johnson, A Survey of Materials Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages in the United States (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1982), supplemented by information from current catalogues for DLI and FSI. DLI, FSI, CIA and NSA responded to a CAL questionnaire on what kinds of course materials (basic texts and supplementary materials) each agency had available. The availability of course materials is taken as an index of languages taught in the agencies.

The information in the last two columns on DOD personnel capabilities and requirements was taken from the report prepared for the Association of American Universities by SRI International, "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe," 1983, pp. 67-69. FY1983 "requirements" refer to "LDPs" (language-designated positions), and "capabilities" refer to the number of people actually filling those LDPs in 1983.

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
LANGUAGE	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
				AFRICA						
Afrikaans	5	5	1	1		X			16	16
Amharic	9	4	3	2		X			7	7
Bambara	6	6	1	1					0	0
Fon	1	1	1	1					0	0
Fulani	3	2	2	1					0	0
Hausa	70	31	11	6					0	1
Ibo	5	5	1	1					0	0
Kikongo	1	1	1	1					0	0
Lingala	1	1	1	1					0	0
Lunda									2	1
Mende	2	2	1	1					0	0
Sango									0	1
Sara									0	1
Shona	13	13	2	2					0	1
Sotho									0	23
Swahili	576	102	39	6	X	X			0	1

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
LANGUAGE	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
			AFRICA (continued)							
Tswa									1	0
Wolof	51	50	2	1					0	0
Xhosa	1	1	1	1					0	0
Yoruba	127	104	6	3					0	0
Zulu	41	41	2	2					0	0
			CARIBBEAN							
Creole-Haitian	13	0	1	0	X	X			1	1
			EAST ASIA							
Chinese	11366	2325	219	16	X	X	X	X	583	606
Cantonese	39	9	3	1	X	X			0	0
Japanese	11506	2958	214	16	X	X	X		142	115
Korean	365	158	16	8	X	X	X	X	890	696

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
LANGUAGE				EASTERN EUROPE & USSR						
Adygey									4	0
Albanian	2	0	2	0	X				16	16
Bulgarian	2	0	2	0	X	X			22	19
Chechen									1	1
Czech	151	33	17	6	X	X			359	281
Estonian	4	4	1	1					0	0
Georgian	5	0	1	0					0	0
Hungarian	98	20	16	2	X	X			29	22
Kashubian									0	1
Latvian	1	0	1	0					0	0
Lithuanian	47	5	3	1					0	0
Polish	1268	190	58	10	X	X	X		278	183
Romanian	187	165	9	5	X	X		X	38	46
Russian	23987	2749	472	12	X	X	X	X	4509	3573
Serbo-Croatian	182	68	24	8	X	X	X	X	72	71

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
LANGUAGE	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
				EASTERN EUROPE & USSR (continued)						
Slovak	21	0	3	0					1	1
Slovenian	21	19	2	1	X				0	0
Ukrainian	111	8	24	3	X				0	2
				INNER ASIA						
Chagatai	2	0	1	0					0	0
Mongolian	13	13	2	2					12	12
Tartar	1	1	1	1					38	45
Tibetan	56	30	5	2					0	0
Turkic	22	0	2	0					0	0
Tuvin	3	3	1	1					0	0
Uzbek	12	9	3	1					0	0
				LATIN AMERICA						
Aymara	5	5	1	1					0	0
Quechua	30	24	5	4					0	0

LANGUAGE	ENROLLMENTS ALL MLA	ENROLLMENTS TITLE VI	NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE MLA	NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE TITLE VI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT DLI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT FSI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT CIA	LANGUAGE TAUGHT NSA	FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES REQ	FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES CAP
				MIDDLE EAST						
Arabic										
Standard	3466	989	125	13	X	X	X	X	839	580
Egyptian	44	29	7	3	X	X	X		0	0
Gulf						X			0	0
Iraqi					X				0	0
Levantine							X		0	0
Saudi							X		0	0
Syrian					X				0	0
Western						X			0	0
Armenian	231	61	14	4					0	0
Azeri	5	5	1	1					0	0
Hebrew	19429	1348	361	13	X	X		X	134	69
Kurdish									1	1
Persian	703	332	30	12	X	X			92	54
Iranian	20	18	3	2					0	0
Syriac	50	21	7	3					0	0
Turkish	147	85	20	10	X	X	X	X	56	53

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
LANGUAGE	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
				NORTH AMERICA						
Cherokee	29	0	1	0					0	0
Crow	16	0	1	0					0	0
Dakota	99	0	2	0					0	0
Kric	24	0	1	0					0	0
Lakota	67	0	3	0					0	0
Navajo	225	0	10	0					0	0
Ojibway	84	0	3	0					0	0
Tlingit	5	0	1	0					0	0
Yupic	85	0	1	0					0	0
				PACIFIC						
Guamanian									5	4
Hawaiian	8	1	610	269					0	0
Samoan	1	1	18	18					0	0
Tahitian	9	9	1	1					0	0
Tongan	11	0	1	0					0	0

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
LANGUAGE	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
				SOUTH ASIA						
Bengali	18	16	5	3		X			1	0
Dari (Afghan Persian)						X			0	0
Hindi	198	96	26	7		X			7	5
Hindi/Urdu	76	49	8	3		X			0	0
Urdu	23	14	5	3		X			8	1
Malayalam	4	4	1	1					0	0
Marathi	6	1	2	1					0	0
Nepali	6	6	2	2		X			0	0
Pushtu (Pashto)					X				5	3
Sinhala	2	0	1	0		X			0	0
Tamil	25	25	5	5		X			0	0
Telugu	9	9	1	1					0	0

LANGUAGE	ENROLLMENTS ALL MLA	ENROLLMENTS TITLE VI	NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE MLA	NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE TITLE VI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT DLI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT FSI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT CIA	LANGUAGE TAUGHT NSA	FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES REQ	FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES CAP
SOUTHEAST ASIA										
Balinese	1	1	1	1					0	0
Burmese	1	1	1	1	X	X			3	1
Cambodian	4	4	1	1	X	X			9	7
Cebuano						X			0	0
Ilocano	17	17	1	1					0	0
Indonesian	113	72	10	4	X	X	X		39	26
Javanese	9	9	3	3					0	0
Lao	2	2	1	1	X	X			4	2
Malay-Indonesian	14	0	2	0	X	X			5	4
Tagalog	263	29	13	3	X	X			8	21
Thai	80	25	11	4	X	X	X	X	38	45
Tuamotuan	2	2	1	1					0	0
Vietnamese	74	11	7	2	X	X	X	X	152	124

LANGUAGE	ENROLLMENTS ALL MLA	ENROLLMENTS TITLE VI	NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE MLA	NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE TITLE VI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT DLI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT FSI	LANGUAGE TAUGHT CIA	LANGUAGE TAUGHT NSA	FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES REQ	FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES CAP
			WESTERN EUROPE							
Basque	21	0	2	0					0	0
Catalan	19	9	3	1					0	0
Danish	293	22	18	1		X	X		25	24
Dutch	500	59	25	2	X	X	X		22	29
Finnish	152	50	12	3		X			10	10
Flemish									19	16
French	248361	0	1828	0	X	X			312	306
Gaelic	15	0	3	0					0	0
German	126910	0	1391	0	X	X			1898	1481
Mod Greek	820	0	43	0	X	X	X		67	73
Icelandic	8	0	1	0		X			0	0
Irish	13	0	5	0					0	0
Italian	34791	0	528	0	X	X			268	316
Norwegian	1616	188	37	1	X	X	X		12	12
Portuguese	4894	191	149	4	X	X	X		89	88

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
LANGUAGE	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
			WESTERN EUROPE (continued)							
Spanish	379379	0	1953	0	X	X			2223	1963
Swedish	1575	220	46	2	X	X	X		9	7
Welsh	8	0	2	0					0	0
Yiddish	944	474	24	4					0	0
			CLASSICAL AND OTHER HISTORICAL LANGUAGES							
Middle East:										
Akkadian	95	56	15	5						
Aramaic	142	21	13	4						
Assyrian	2	2	1	1						
Coptic	12	1	3	1						
Hittite	6	5	2	1						
Sumerian	15	9	5	3						
Ottoman-Turkish	5	2	2	1						
Ugaritic	22	4	5	1						

	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
LANGUAGE	CLASSICAL AND OTHER HISTORICAL LANGUAGES (continued)									
Inner Asia:										
Classical Mongolian	7	7	1	1						
South Asia:										
Pali	24	3	4	2						
Sanskrit	218	106	22	7						
Vedic	1	0	1	0						
Europe:										
Ancient Greek	22111	0	656	0						
Old Icelandic	23	0	4	0						

LANGUAGE	ENROLLMENTS		NO. OF INSTITUTIONS TEACHING LANGUAGE		LANGUAGE TAUGHT				FY1983 DOD INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS/ CAPABILITIES	
	ALL MLA	TITLE VI	MLA	TITLE VI	DLI	FSI	CIA	NSA	REQ	CAP
CLASSICAL AND OTHER HISTORICAL LANGUAGES (continued)										
Europe (continued):										
Latin	25035	0	535	0						
Old Church Slavonic	44	3	6	1						

E

Language Enrollments in 39 Title VI Centers, 1982

This appendix presents for each language within each world area study group the percent of enrollments in 1st and 2nd year language courses, 3rd year, and 4th and higher year, in a sample of 39 Title VI programs in 1982.

	LEVEL OF COURSE BY YEAR			TOTAL ENROLLMENT
	1st+2nd %	3rd %	4th+HIGHER %	NO.
LANGUAGE		AFRICA		
Swahili	95.5	4.0	-	89
Wolof	100.0	-	-	56
Amharic	100.0	-	-	3
Lingala	100.0	-	-	8
Hausa	91.0	8.6	-	23
Afrikaans	100.0	-	-	2
Xhosa	100.0	-	-	1
Yoruba	100.0	-	-	5
Krio	100.0	-	-	2
Bambara	100.0	-	-	7
Somali	100.0	-	-	1
Zulu	100.0	-	-	13

Sample Size: 4 out of 10 AF centers, 1982.

Note: Since these data are taken from Title VI center applications, each language is classified in the world area of the Title VI center at which it is taught, not necessarily in which it is spoken.

	LEVEL OF COURSE BY YEAR			TOTAL ENROLLMENT
	1st+2nd %	3rd %	4th+HIGHER %	NO.
LANGUAGE		EAST ASIA		
Chinese	76.0	13.0	10.5	1415
Classical Chinese	87.0	13.0	-	154
Japanese	78.0	11.8	10.0	1567
Classical Japanese	85.7	-	14.0	14
Korean	83.5	15.8	1.0	170
Tibetan	100.0	-	-	1
Literary Tibetan	100.0	-	-	4
Written Mongolian	100.0	-	-	6
Vietnamese	100.0	-	-	2
Manchu	100.0	-	-	3
Cantonese	100.0	-	-	2
		EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR		
Bulgarian	100.0	-	-	49
Czech	79.5	11.0	9.0	44
Polish	95.0	2.0	2.5	194
Romanian	87.0	12.6	-	324
Russian	73.0	15.0	11.0	2152
Serbo-Croatian	87.7	3.0	8.8	90

Sample Size: 7 out of 16 EA centers. 1982.
6 out of 12 EE centers, 1982.

Note: Since these data are taken from Title VI center applications, each language is classified in the world area of the Title VI center at which it is taught, not necessarily in which it is spoken.

	LEVEL OF COURSE BY YEAR			TOTAL ENROLLMENT
	1st+2nd %	3rd %	4th+HIGHER %	NO.
LANGUAGE	EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR (continued)			
Uzbek	93.7	6.0	-	16
Turkic	100.0	-	-	3
Hungarian	79.5	20.0	-	49
Ukrainian	100.0	-	-	55
Old Church Slavonic	100.0	-	-	15
Estonian	100.0	-	-	6
Tartar	100.0	-	-	2
Chuvash	100.0	-	-	4
Finnish	69.5	21.7	8.6	23
Yiddish	54.0	20.8	25.0	24
Mod. Greek	91.0	8.6	-	150
Armenian	90.9	9.0	-	22
W. Armenian	100.0	-	-	10
	INNER ASIA			
Hungarian	75.0	25.0	-	16
Finnish	100.0	-	-	8
Estonian	100.0	-	-	6
Turkish	100.0	-	-	7
Mongolian	100.0	-	-	5
Classical Mongolian	100.0	-	-	4
Tibetan	71.4	28.5	-	7
Ottoman Turkish	100.0	-	-	2
Tartar	100.0	-	-	1

Sample Size: 1 out of 1 IA center, 1982.

Note: Since these data are taken from Title VI center applications, each language is classified in the world area of the Title VI center at which it is taught, not necessarily in which it is spoken.

	LEVEL OF COURSE BY YEAR			TOTAL ENROLLMENT
	1st+2nd %	3rd %	4th+HIGHER %	NO.
LANGUAGE		LATIN AMERICA		
Nahuatl	100.0	-	-	2
Portuguese	80.7	11.5	7.8	398
Quechua	100.0	-	-	12
Quiche maya	100.0	-	-	10
Spanish	76.5	16.2	7.3	7368
		MIDDLE EAST		
Arabic				
Colloquial& unspecified	84.7	9.0	5.8	341
Literary	84.0	16.0	-	25
Cairene	100.0	-	-	8
Eastern	100.0	-	-	20
Aramaic	100.0	-	-	11
Akkadian	100.0	-	-	16
Coptic	100.0	-	-	2
Old Egyptian	100.0	-	-	4
Middle Egyptian	100.0	-	-	11
Late Egyptian	100.0	-	-	5
Hebrew				
Colloquial& unspecified	87.5	10.9	3.0	491
Biblical	93.7	6.0	-	16
Ugaritic	100.0	-	-	13
Persian	96.0	3.6	-	138

Sample Size: 6 out of 16 LA centers, 1982.
5 out of 13 ME centers, 1982.

Note: Since these data are taken from Title VI center applications, each language is classified in the world area of the Title VI center at which it is taught, not necessarily in which it is spoken.

	LEVEL OF COURSE BY YEAR			TOTAL ENROLLMENT
	1st+2nd	3rd	4th+HIGHER	
	%	%	%	NO.
LANGUAGE	MIDDLE EAST (continued)			
Literary Persian	100.0	-	-	3
Uzbek	100.0	-	-	3
Old Turkic	100.0	-	-	1
Colloquial Turkish	93.7	6.0	-	32
Literary Turkish & Tanzimat	100.0	-	-	8
Ottoman Turkish	66.6	33.0	-	3
Urdu	66.6	33.0	-	3
Classical Greek	100.0	-	-	13
Modern Greek	100.0	-	-	17
	SOUTH ASIA			
Hindi-Urdu	71.2	21.0	7.0	108
Sanskrit	62.5	22.9	14.5	131
Tibetan	100.0	-	-	8
Literary Tibetan	36.0	27.0	36.0	11
Bengali	78.5	21.0	-	14
Indonesian (Malay)	50.0	50.0	-	2
Nepali	66.6	33.3	-	6

Sample Size: 6 out of 8 SA centers, 1982.

Note: Since these data are taken from Title VI center applications, each language is classified in the world area of the Title VI center at which it is taught, not necessarily in which it is spoken.

	LEVEL OF COURSE BY YEAR			TOTAL ENROLLMENT
	1st+2nd %	3rd %	4th+HIGHER %	NO.
LANGUAGE	SOUTH ASIA (continued)			
Persian	80.9	4.7	14.0	42
Pali	100.0	-	-	4
Tamil	73.0	13.0	13.0	15
Classical Tamil	100.0	-	-	1
Gujarati	100.0	-	-	2
Telugu	100.0	-	-	5
Prakrit	100.0	-	-	3
Middle Iranian	100.0	-	-	2
Marathi	100.0	-	-	5
	SOUTHEAST ASIA			
Indonesian	62.5	35.7	2.0	56
Javanese	100.0	-	-	3
Tagalog	65.0	34.6	-	26
Vietnamese	75.0	-	25.0	4
Cambodian	100.0	-	-	5
Sanskrit	75.7	24.0	-	33
Old Javanese	100.0	-	-	5
Pali	100.0	-	-	2
Thai	65.6	20.6	13.7	29

Sample Size: 3 out of 4 SE centers, 1982.

Note: Since these data are taken from Title VI center applications, each language is classified in the area of the Title VI center at which it is taught, not necessarily in which it is spoken.

F

Research Profile of Title VI Faculty

The 45 tables in this appendix present a cross-sectional view of the research profile of the faculty at Title VI centers over a five year period. These tabulations show the disciplinary and geographical coverage of the publications of faculty at these centers. The number of articles and books written about each country and the number of authors who wrote the articles and books on each country are tabulated in the charts showing the general disciplinary distribution by country for each world area. No author was counted twice in the enumeration of authors writing on a given country.

From these detailed lists, one can see which geographical areas of the world are well covered from a research point of view and where the gaps in country coverage are. Similar patterns can be seen in the topical coverage; a few disciplines are well represented in the distribution of publications but there are also noticeable gaps in topical coverage.

For the purposes of Tables F.1 through F.11, world area totals for disciplinary and subdisciplinary distribution of publications reflect the country or region covered by the publication, not the world area of the Title VI center of origin. The following lists indicate which countries and regions were included in the totals for each world area.

AFRICA

Africa as a whole
West Africa
Central Africa
Eastern Africa
Southern Africa
Horn of Africa
French Speaking Africa
Portuguese Speaking Africa
English Speaking Africa
Spanish Speaking Africa
Angola
Botswana
Burundi
Cameroon
Central African Republic
Chad
Dahomey
Diego Garcia
Djibouti
Ethiopia
French Somaliland
Gabon
Gambia
Ghana
Guinea
Ivory Coast
Kenya
Mali
Lesotho
Liberia
Malagassy Republic
Malawi
Mozambique
Niger
Nigeria
Guinea - Bissau
Republic of Congo
Zaire
Republic of South Africa
Zimbabwe
Rwanda
Sahel
Senegal
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Somali Republic
South West Africa (Namibia)
Western Sahara [SADR]
Sudan
Swaziland
Tanzania
Togo
Uganda
Upper Volta
Zambia
Comoro Islands
Equatorial Guinea
Sao Tome & Principe
Sahara

EAST ASIA

East Asia as a whole
China
Mainland China
Taiwan
Hong Kong
Japan
Korea
North Korea
South Korea
Macao
Manchuria
Mongolia
Tibet

EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR

Eastern Europe
Eastern Europe (excl. USSR)
Albania
Bulgaria
Czechoslovakia
East Germany
Hungary
Poland
Romania
USSR as a whole
Slavic Republics
Russian SFSR
Belorussia
Ukraine
Moldavia
Baltic republics
Lithuania
Latvia
Estonia
Caucasus
Armenia
Georgia
Azerbaijan
Soviet Central Asia
Kazakhstan
Kirghizia
Turkmenistan
Uzbekistan
Tadzhikistan
Yugoslavia

Note: For Tables F.1 through F.11, publications about Germany as a whole were not included. Publications specifically about East Germany were included in Eastern Europe totals; publications about West Germany were included in Western Europe totals.

INNER ASIA

Inner Asia as a whole

LATIN AMERICA

Latin America as a whole
Central America
West Indies & Bermuda
South America
Andean Nations
LAFTA
Argentina
Bahamas
Belize
Bolivia
Brazil
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
El Salvador
French Guiana
Guatemala
Guyana
Haiti
Honduras
Jamaica
Mexico
Netherlands Antilles
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Puerto Rico
Surinam
Trinidad and Tobago
Uruguay
Venezuela
Falkland Islands
French West Indies
Amazonia

MIDDLE EAST

Middle East & Northern Africa
Middle East
Arabian Peninsula
Northern Africa
Near East
All Arab States
Aden
Algeria
Bahrain
Cyprus
Iran
Iraq
Israel
Jordan
Kuwait
Lebanon
Libya
Morocco
Oman
Qatar
Saudia Arabia
South Yemen
Syria
Tunisia
Turkey
United Arab Republic
Yemen
United Arab Emirates

SOUTH ASIA

South Asia as a whole
Afghanistan
Bangladesh
Bhutan
Sri Lanka
India
Maldive Islands
Nepal
Pakistan
Sikkim

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Southeast Asia as a whole
Indochina
Brunei
Burma
Cambodia
Indonesia
Laos
Malaysia
Philippines
Portuguese Timor
Singapore
Thailand
Vietnam
North Vietnam
South Vietnam

WESTERN EUROPE

Europe as a whole
Western Europe
Southern Europe
Central Europe
Austria
Belgium
Denmark
Finland
France
West Germany
Great Britain
Greece
Iceland
Republic of Ireland
Northern Ireland
Italy
Luxembourg
Netherlands
Norway
Portugal
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Andorra
Gibraltar
Liechtenstein
Malta
Monaco
San Marino
Vatican City

World Area Totals

Table F.1

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO- GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Africa	132	37	118	21	74	77	42	22	130	640
East Asia	120	86	128	11	217	142	161	84	147	1089
Eastern Europe and USSR	69	21	85	12	115	86	164	28	143	678
Inner Asia	4	-	-	1	4	13	7	3	1	29
Latin America	382	70	236	54	152	46	235	27	196	1334
Middle East	100	113	61	8	116	134	143	178	112	874
South Asia	87	72	22	6	67	52	82	149	59	439
Southeast Asia	57	15	25	14	21	45	4	16	40	205
Western Europe	38	27	22	4	82	32	116	20	56	356

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table F.2

Distribution of Publications in Anthropology and Sociology
By World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	GENERAL	DEMOGRAPHY	RURAL SOCIOLOGY	URBAN SOCIOLOGY	INDUSTRIAL SOCIOLOGY	SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY	SOCIAL CONFLICT	FAMILY, KINSHIP	SOCIAL GROUPS	ARCHAEOLOGY
Africa	10	4	6	7	5	24	11	9	41	21
East Asia	24	19	11	6	5	20	12	4	19	5
Eastern Europe and USSR	9	7	3	-	2	8	1	5	33	3
Inner Asia	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Latin America	33	24	15	19	5	49	8	26	121	91
Middle East	22	10	2	12	2	27	4	1	34	79
South Asia	19	3	6	1	9	11	3	7	32	8
Southeast Asia	14	9	5	1	1	13	4	2	7	5
Western Europe	6	1	1	-	3	10	3	2	11	3

Table F.3

Distribution of Publications in Art by World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	GENERAL	ARCHITECTURE	CINEMA	DANCE	FOLK ART	MUSIC	PAINTING	ARCHAEOLOGY	SCULPTURE	THEATER
Africa	10	6	2	1	8	6	1	-	3	1
East Asia	10	-	4	-	1	11	42	3	1	14
Eastern Europe and USSR	3	3	1	-	1	5	6	-	-	3
Inner Asia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Latin America	13	15	2	2	8	7	5	6	3	9
Middle East	10	33	-	-	4	10	9	52	4	1
South Asia	10	19	3	2	1	26	3	2	6	4
Southeast Asia	4	-	-	2	1	6	1	1	-	1
Western Europe	4	10	4	-	-	2	6	-	2	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table F.4

Distribution of Publications in Economics By World Area, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	RURAL AGRICULTURE	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
WORLD AREA							
Africa	12	50	6	5	31	12	8
East Asia	25	23	15	15	27	11	15
Eastern Europe and USSR	16	9	21	7	11	22	3
Inner Asia	-		-	-	-	-	-
Latin America	18	59	43	19	53	43	10
Middle East	11	9	8	1	15	10	12
South Asia	2	13	-	-	8	5	2
Southeast Asia	4	5	4	2	4	4	2
Western Europe	1	1	11	2	3	-	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table F.5

Distribution of Publications in Geography By World Area, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	URBAN	RURAL	CULTURAL	HUMAN	DESCRIPTIVE, TRAVEL	REGIONAL
WORLD AREA							
Africa	4	1	8	2	5	-	2
East Asia	-	5	-	2	1	2	1
Eastern Europe and USSR	8	-	-	-	3	-	1
Inner Asia	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Latin America	1	4	8	9	3	2	27
Middle East	2	1	-	1	-	-	4
South Asia	1	1	-	1	-	1	2
Southeast Asia	1	2	-	2	4	2	4
Western Europe	1	-	-	1	1	-	1

Table F.6

Distribution of Publications in History By World Area, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	BIOGRAPHICAL	UP TO 1000	1000 to 1500	1500 to 1800	1800 to 1947	1948 on
WORLD AREA							
Africa	23	7	-	-	12	27	6
East Asia	32	20	38	30	29	49	20
Eastern Europe and USSR	15	14	5	8	22	48	2
Inner Asia	2	-	1	1	-	-	-
Latin America	15	3	17	11	25	76	16
Middle East	18	8	58	16	9	11	5
South Asia	20	17	6	1	6	17	3
Southeast Asia	12	-	1	2	-	3	3
Western Europe	7	4	9	17	19	25	5

Table F.7

Distribution of Publications in Language & Linguistics By World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	GENERAL	COMPARATIVE	DESCRIPTIVE LINGUISTICS	HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS	SOCIAL LINGUISTICS	PHONOLOGY	MORPHOLOGY LEXICOLOGY	SYNTAX	PEDAGOGY, TEXTBOOK
Africa	4	1	12	5	8	17	11	10	9
East Asia	7	5	3	9	17	12	21	19	51
Eastern Europe and USSR	8	-	6	17	6	14	10	12	15
Inner Asia	-	2	2	4	-	-	5	-	1
Latin America	3	-	11	10	9	2	2	8	1
Middle East	10	4	13	44	8	9	17	11	27
South Asia	5	2	7	8	3	6	17	5	8
Southeast Asia	6	2	4	8	3	1	6	6	10
Western Europe	2	3	1	2	4	2	6	5	8

Table F.8

Distribution of Publications in Literature By World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	GENERAL	CRITICISM, THEORY	FICTION	FOLKLORE	POETRY	TRANSLATION	DRAMA
Africa	8	3	1	24	5	1	-
East Asia	29	11	67	2	33	3	17
Eastern Europe and USSR	41	8	48	4	41	12	12
Inner Asia	1	-	-	2	3	1	-
Latin America	46	29	82	14	64	-	7
Middle East	26	36	19	6	42	26	1
South Asia	16	14	10	9	21	22	4
Southeast Asia	-	-	1	1	-	2	-
Western Europe	14	15	29	4	49	1	11

Table F.9

Distribution of Publications in Philosophy & Religion By World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM	CONFUCIANISM	BUDDHISM	HINDUISM	JUDAISM	SECTS & MOVEMENTS	TEXTS	OTHER RELIGIONS
Africa	5	2	5	-	-	-	-	2	-	8
East Asia	16	1	-	13	41	-	-	1	1	16
Eastern Europe and USSR	10	8	1	-	1	-	5	4	1	-
Inner Asia	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Latin America	7	10	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	8
Middle East	10	16	89	-	-	-	60	8	13	8
South Asia	30	1	21	1	29	59	-	9	28	6
Southeast Asia	5	-	1	-	9	1	-	-	1	-
Western Europe	9	5	4	-	-	-	2	1	-	1

Table F.10

Distribution of Publications in Political Science By World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	GENERAL	POLITICAL FIGURES	POLITICAL PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	POLITICAL BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	LEVELS OF POLITICAL SYSTEMS
Africa	30	1	2	1	30	21	14	2	25	11
East Asia	19	13	4	8	24	50	12	3	12	5
Eastern Europe and USSR	21	11	4	-	36	35	6	7	23	6
Inner Asia	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Latin America	24	1	4	2	70	33	7	4	46	7
Middle East	11	5	3	-	25	32	9	7	35	5
South Asia	7	7	2	7	17	6	1	4	15	4
Southeast Asia	2	1	2	2	10	9	3	-	11	1
Western Europe	6	3	5	4	17	7	2	-	15	1

Table F.11

Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications By World Area, 1976-1981

WORLD AREA	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Africa	5	26	4	16	8	10
East Asia	8	28	10	10	42	18
Eastern Europe and USSR	9	8	2	2	10	15
Inner Asia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Latin America	6	32	64	42	28	17
Middle East	3	12	33	7	13	11
South Asia	3	3	-	3	12	3
Southeast Asia	-	1	-	1	7	2
Western Europe	2	6	3	1	1	3

Africa

Table F.12

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO- GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Africa as a whole	47	15	41	1	22	16	26	7	33	118	215
West Africa	2	2	6	-	4	5	1	1	1	18	22
Central Africa	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	4
Eastern Africa	2	-	4	3	-	8	-	-	4	16	23
Southern Africa	1	-	1	1	1	8	-	-	12	14	23
Horn of Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	3
French Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	2
Portuguese Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
English Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Spanish Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Angola	8	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	4	12
Botswana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	4
Burundi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cameroon	3	4	7	-	2	1	1	-	2	7	16
Central African Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chad	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	3
Dahomey	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
Diego Garcia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Ethiopia	4	-	2	-	3	3	-	1	5	14	15
French Somaliland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.12 (continued)

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO- GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Gabon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gambia	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	2
Ghana	12	4	7	-	1	2	-	1	2	17	29
Guinea	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	3
Ivory Coast	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	4	5
Djibouti	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kenya	6	1	7	5	2	-	-	1	5	18	25
Mali	1	4	1	-	5	3	-	-	-	5	14
Lesotho	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	2	3
Liberia	2	1	-	-	1	4	-	-	3	5	10
Malagasy Republic	1	-	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	2	6
Malawi	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	3
Mozambique	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	4	3	6
Niger	1	-	3	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	6
Nigeria	7	3	5	4	3	13	2	1	5	21	41
Guinea - Bissau	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	3
Republic of Congo	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
Zaire	3	-	2	-	1	1	1	-	10	8	17
Republic of South Africa	9	-	1	-	3	2	6	2	19	23	43
Zimbabwe	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	5	6	9
Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Sahel	1	-	6	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Senegal	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	2	-	3	4
Seychelles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra Leone	2	-	3	-	-	2	-	1	1	6	8
Somali Republic	-	-	-	-	3	1	3	-	1	3	8

Table F.13 (continued)

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO- GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
South West Africa (Namibia)	3	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	3	7
Western Sahara [SADR]	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
Sudan	-	2	3	1	1	-	-	1	1	7	8
Swaziland	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	2
Tanzania	2	-	7	1	2	1	-	-	4	14	21
Togo	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Uganda	9	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	5	7	13
Upper Volta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zambia	11	-	2	-	2	-	-	1	4	7	16
Comoro Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equatorial Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sao Tome & Principe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sahara	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1

Table F.13

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
COUNTRY							
Africa as a whole	4	18	2	1	15	5	-
West Africa	1	2	1	-	1	1	1
Central Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eastern Africa	-	1	-	1	1	-	1
Southern Africa	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Horn of Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
French Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portuguese Sperking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
English Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Angola	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Botswana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burundi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cameroon	2	3	1	-	-	-	1
Central African Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dahomey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diego Garcia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethiopia	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
French Somaliland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gabon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Ghana	1	1	-	-	3	1	1
Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ivory Coast	-	4	-	-	-	2	-
Djibouti	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kenya	-	3	-	-	2	1	1

Table F.13 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics
by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
Mali	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Lesotho	-	-	-	-	-		-
Liberia	-	-	-	-	-		-
Malagasy Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mozambique	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Niger	1	-	-	-	2	-	-
Nigeria	1	2	1	-	-	1	-
Guinea - Bissau	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Republic of Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zaire	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Republic of South Africa	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Zimbabwe	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sahel	-	3	-	-	3	-	-
Senegal	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Seychelles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra Leone	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
Somali Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South West Africa (Namibia)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Western Sahara(SADR)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudan	1	1	-	-	1	-	-
Swaziland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tanzania	-	5	1	-	1	-	-
Togo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uganda	-	-	-	-	2	-	1

Table F.13 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics
by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
COUNTRY							
Upper Volta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zambia	-	-	-	-	1	1	-
Comoro Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equatorial Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sao Tome & Principe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sahara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.14

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Africa as a whole	15	-	-	-	6	10	2	-	2	1
West Africa	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Central Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eastern Africa	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1
Southern Africa	1	1	-	-	3	2	3	-	1	2
Horn of Africa	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-
French Speaking	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portuguese Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
English Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish Speaking Africa	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-
Angola	-	-	-		-	2	-	-	-	-
Botswana	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Burundi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cameroon	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
Central African	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dahomey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diego Garcia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethiopia	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-
French Somaliland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gabon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ghana	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-

Table F.14 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science
by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
COUNTRY										
Guinea	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Ivory Coast	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Djibouti	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kenya	1	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-
Mali	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lesotho	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Liberia	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
Malagassy Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mozambique	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-
Niger	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigeria	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Guinea - Bissau	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Republic of Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zaire	2	-	-	-	3	2	1	-	3	-
Republic of South Africa	2	-	-	-	9	2	-	-	4	2
Zimbabwe	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Sahel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senegal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seychelles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra Leone	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Somali Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
South West Africa (Namibia)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-

Table F.14 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science
by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Western Sahara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudan	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Swaziland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tanzania	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-
Togo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uganda	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-
Upper Volta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
Comoro Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equatorial Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sao Tome & Principe	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sahara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.15

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications
by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Africa as a whole	1	12	2	3	5	4
West Africa	-	-	-	1	-	-
Central Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eastern Africa	-	-	1	2	-	-
Southern Africa	-	1	-	-	-	-
Horn of Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-
French Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	1	-
Portuguese Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-
English Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	1	-
Spanish Speaking Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Angola	-	-	-	-	-	-
Botswana	-	-	-	-	-	1
Burundi	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cameroon	1	1	-	-	-	-
Central African Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chad	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dahomey	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diego Garcia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ethiopia	-	1	-	-	-	-
French Somaliland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gabon	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gambia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ghana	-	-	-	5	-	-
Guinea	1	-	-	-	-	-
Ivory Coast	-	-	-	[illegible]	-	-
Djibouti	-	-	-	[illegible]	-	-
Kenya	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.15 (continued)

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Mali	1	-	-	-	-	-
Lesotho	-	-	-	-	-	-
Liberia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malagasy Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malawi	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mozambique	-	-	-	-	-	-
Niger	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nigeria	-	2	-	1	-	-
Guinea - Bissau	-	-	-	-	-	-
Republic of Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zaire	-	4	-	-	-	-
Rep. of South Africa	2	4	1	-	-	5
Zimbabwe	-	-	-	-	1	-
Rwanda	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sahel	-	-	-	-	-	-
Senegal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seychelles	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sierra Leone	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somali Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-
South West Africa (Namibia)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Western Sahara[SADR]	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sudan	-	-	-	-	1	-
Swaziland	-	-	-	1	-	-
Tanzania	-	2	-	3	-	-
Togo	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uganda	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper Volta	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.15 (continued)

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications
by Country for Africa, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Comoro Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equatorial Guinea	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sao Tome & Principe	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sahara	-	-	-	-	-	-

East Asia

Table F.16

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for East Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO- GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
East Asia as a whole	4	7	5	-	5	3	2	8	8	40	47
China	22	23	16	4	100	59	87	42	29	185	375
Mainland China	21	3	37	1	16	9	9	2	48	77	150
Taiwan	11	1	9	1	1	8	2	-	11	31	43
Hong Kong	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Japan	47	51	52	3	80	47	53	16	50	193	384
Korea	11	2	8	2	15	22	4	2	7	43	76
North Korea	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	4	4
South Korea	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	5
Macao	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Manchuria	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2
Mongolia	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	2
Tibet	-	-	-	-	6	3	1	15	-	15	23

Table F.17

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for East Asia, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
COUNTRY							
East Asia as a whole	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
China	4	3	-	-	5	3	2
Mainland China	4	12	4	3	8	5	2
Taiwan	3	-	1	-	4	1	-
Hong Kong	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Japan	9	5	11	11	6	2	10
Korea	-	3	1	-	4	-	-
North Korea	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
South Korea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Macao	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manchuria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mongolia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tibet	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.18

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science by Country for East Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
East Asia as a whole	1	-	-	-	-	5	1	-	1	-
China	2	2	2	-	5	11	3	1	2	1
Mainland China	5	5	2	-	12	12	5	2	5	2
Taiwan	2	1	-	-	1	5	-	-	1	1
Hong Kong	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Japan	7	4	1	8	4	21	3	-	3	-
Korea	1	-	-	-	2	4	-	-	-	-
North Korea	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Korea	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Macao	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manchuria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mongolia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tibet	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.19

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications by Country for East Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
East Asia as a whole	-	1	-	3	9	-
China	1	5	7	2	7	3
Mainland China	3	10	1	5	7	10
Taiwan	-	-	-	-	1	-
Hong Kong	-	-	-	-	-	-
Japan	3	9	2	-	19	5
Korea	1	2	-	-	1	-
North Korea	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Korea	-	-	-	-	-	-
Macao	-	-	-	-	1	-
Manchuria	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mongolia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tibet	-	1	-	-	-	-

Eastern Europe and USSR

Table F.20

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Eastern Europe and USSR, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
E.E. excl. USSR	1	-	5	-	-	-	1	-	4	7	9
Eastern Europe	4	-	7	-	1	12	4	-	6	23	38
Albania	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Bulgaria	2	-	-	-	1	-	3	2	1	5	7
Czechoslovakia	-	-	-	-	3	3	11	1	4	12	20
East Germany	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	4
Germany as a whole	1	4	1	-	9	1	4	9	12	23	33
Hungary	1	-	1	-	8	-	-	1	5	9	12
Poland	3	1	3	-	14	2	15	2	18	22	51
Rumania	3	-	5	-	2	2	5	1	5	8	21
USSR	40	16	57	9	84	62	120	20	98	175	478
USSR as a whole	34	14	53	7	59	34	100	14	88	139	384
Slavic Republics	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	-	-	7	8
Russian SFSR	2	-	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	8	11
Belorussia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukraine	-	-	-	1	7	3	2	1	5	12	16
Moldavia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baltic Republics	2	-	2	-	6	-	-	-	1	5	8
Lithuania	-	-	-	-	-	3	9	-	-	3	12
Latvia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	1	4
Caucasus	2	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	1	4	5
Armenia	-	2	-	-	5	3	4	3	2	8	18
Georgia	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	1	4	6

Note: Totals for USSR include publications on the USSR as a whole and publications on any constituent republic.

Table F.20 (continued)

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Eastern Europe and USSR, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Azerbaijan	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	5
Soviet Central Asia	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	2
Kazakhstan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kirghizia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkmenistan	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	2
Uzbekistan	1	-	-	-	2	6	1	-	-	5	9
Tadzhikistan	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
Yugoslavia	14	3	8	3	8	6	6	1	4	23	49

Table F.21

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics
by Country for Eastern Europe and USSR, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
Eastern Europe	-	-	-	-	2	3	-
E.E. excl. USSR	-	-	5	1	-	1	1
Albania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Germany as a whole	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Czechoslovakia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
East Germany	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hungary	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Poland	-	1	2	-	-	-	-
Rumania	-	-	2	1	2	-	-
USSR	12	8	11	4	7	17	1
Yugoslavia	4	-	2	1	-	-	1

Table F.22

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science by Country for Eastern Europe and USSR, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Eastern Europe	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	2	–
E.E. excl. USSR	1	–	–	–	3	1	–	–	1	–
Albania	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Bulgaria	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Czechoslovakia	1	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	–	–
Germany as a whole	1	–	–	–	5	–	4	–	3	–
East Germany	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hungary	1	3	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
Poland	2	1	–	–	9	1	1	–	3	2
Romania	4	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
USSR	8	7	5	–	18	32	5	7	17	4
Yugoslavia	1	1	–	–	2	1	–	–	–	–

Table F.23

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications by Country for Eastern Europe and USSR, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Eastern Europe	-	1	-	-	-	-
E.E. excl. USSR	1	1	-	-	1	1
Albania	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bulgaria	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czechoslovakia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Germany as a whole	1	1	-	-	-	-
East Germany	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hungary	-	-	-	1	-	-
Poland	1	-	-	-	-	-
Rumania	-	-	-	-	-	-
USSR	5	6	2	1	8	14
Yugoslavia	3	-	-	-	1	-

Inner Asia

Table F.24

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Inner Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Inner Asia as a whole	4	-	-	1	4	13	7	3	1	13	29

Table F.25

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science
by Country for Inner Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Inner Asia as a whole	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-

Latin America

Table F.26

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Latin America, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIO	ART	ECON	GEO- GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Latin America as a whole	120	21	60	12	52	13	39	9	50	150	336
Central America	6	-	12	1	3	1	-	2	3	20	28
West Indies & Bermuda	10	1	9	4	3	-	4	1	6	27	36
South America	3	1	3	-	-	-	1	1	2	12	16
Andean Nations	2	-	-	1	-	?	-	-	-	4	5
LAFTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Argentina	7	3	5	1	5	-	40	-	6	42	65
Bahamas	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Belize	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Bolivia	3	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	6	10
Brazil	40	1	46	1	15	4	42	2	26	71	137
Chile	3	1	5	5	6	-	16	1	23	29	61
Colombia	18	1	13	4	1	-	6	-	3	32	68
Costa Rica	2	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	8	9	15
Cuba	4	1	4	-	-	1	18	-	15	27	66
Dominican Republic	-	-	2	2	3	-	-	-	-	6	7
Ecuador	18	-	2	1	-	6	1	4	1	13	30
El Salvador	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
French Guiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	19	1	12	6	-	-	2	-	1	17	40
Guyana	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	4
Haiti	2	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	5	11
Honduras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.26 (continued)

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Latin America, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Jamaica	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	3	9
Mexico	83	28	46	6	52	16	48	5	28	140	269
Nicaragua	1	-	1	1	1	-	2	-	3	6	9
Panama	1	1	3	2	2	-	-	-	3	12	17
Paraguay	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	3	5
Peru	25	8	10	-	8	1	9	1	11	37	70
Puerto Rico	3	1	1	-	1	-	5	-	1	8	15
Surinam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	3
Uruguay	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	4	5
Venezuela	9	2	3	4	1	-	-	-	-	11	18
Falkland Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
French West Indies	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	2
Netherlands Antilles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Amazonia	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1

Table F.27

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for Latin America, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
Latin America as a whole	-	8	17	9	14	9	3
Central America	1	1	4	-	3	3	1
West Indies & Bermuda	2	5	1	1	-	-	-
South America	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Andean Nations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAFTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Argentina	1	-	3	-	-	1	-
Bahamas	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Belize	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bolivia	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
Brazil	7	11	5	4	12	11	1
Chile	-	2	-	1	2	-	-
Colombia	4	1	3	-	3	2	-
Costa Rica	-	-	1	-	1	2	-
Cuba	1	-	-	-	2	1	-
Dominican Republic	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Ecuador	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
El Salvador	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
French Guiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	-	10	-	-	1	-	1
Guyana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Haiti	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Honduras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jamaica	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mexico	2	10	8	3	11	10	4
Nicaragua	-	1	-	-	1	-	-

Table F.27 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for Latin America, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
Panama	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
Paraguay	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peru	1	3	2	-	-	3	1
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Surinam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uruguay	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
Venezuela	-	1	1	-	1	-	-
Falkland Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
French West Indies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands Antilles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amazonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.28

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science by Country for Latin America, 1976 ' ?81

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Latin America as a whole	9	-	1	-	16	14	-	3	7	1
Central America	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-
West Indies & Bermuda	2	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-
South America	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andean Nations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAFTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Argentina	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	-
Bahamas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belize	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bolivia	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-
Brazil	1	-	-	2	12	2	1	-	7	2
Chile	7	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	9	1
Colombia	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Costa Rica	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	1
Cuba	-	-	-	-	2	6	2	-	4	1
Dominican Republic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ecuador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
El Salvador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
French Guiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Guyana	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Haiti	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Honduras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jamaica	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Mexico	1	-	1	-	11	8	2	1	4	-

Table F.28 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science
by Country for Latin America, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Panama	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-
Paraguay	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Peru	-	-	2	-	4	-	3	-	2	-
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Surinam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uruguay	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Venezuela	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Falkland Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
French West Indies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands Antilles	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Amazonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.29

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications by Country for Latin America, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Latin America as a whole	4	11	8	7	13	1
Central America	-	-	2	-	1	3
West Indies & Bermuda	-	-	2	1	-	1
South America	-	2	3	1	1	-
Andean Nations	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAFTA	-	-	-	-	-	-
Argentina	-	-	2	-	1	1
Bahamas	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belize	-	-	-	-	1	-
Bolivia	-	-	-	4	1	-
Brazil	-	1	8	1	2	-
Chile	-	2	-	6	1	-
Colombia	-	2	4	1	1	1
Costa Rica	-	-	1	2	-	-
Cuba	-	5	-	1	-	4
Dominican Republic	-	-	2	-	-	-
Ecuador	-	1	2	1	-	-
El Salvador	-	-	-	1	-	-
French Guiana	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	-	-	4	6	-	-
Guyana	-	-	1	-	-	-
Haiti	-	2	3	-	-	1
Honduras	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jamaica	-	-	3	-	-	-
Mexico	2	2	8	4	4	7
Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.29 (continued)

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications
by Country for Latin America, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Panama	-	-	5	-	-	1
Paraguay	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peru	-	5	4	-	1	-
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	5	-	-
Surinam	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	-	-	1	-	-	-
Uruguay	-	-	-	-	-	-
Venezuela	-	-	2	-	1	-
Falkland Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-
French West Indies	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands Antilles	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amazonia	-	-	-	1	-	-

The Middle East

Table F.30

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Middle East, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Middle East & North Africa	58	50	13	2	68	46	47	119	40	149	388
Middle East	7	6	3	-	1	11	1	1	2	8	22
Arabian Peninsula	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1
Northern Africa	1	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	4
Near East	5	1	2	-	-	1	-	3	2	7	11
All Arab States	3	1	2	-	-	6	14	1	2	20	29
Aden	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
Algeria	2	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	5	5	9
Bahrain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4
Iran	23	17	8	2	18	18	30	15	21	50	129
Iraq	3	-	1	-	2	3	5	3	3	11	15
Israel	17	-	1	1	2	14	13	9	11	27	36
Jordan	3	8	1	1	-	2	2	-	2	7	17
Kuwait	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1
Lebanon	-	-	1	-	1	-	4	1	-	5	7
Libya	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	4	2	5	9
Morocco	7	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	1	7	10
Oman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
Qatar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saudi Arabia	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	5	5

Table 9.10 (continued)

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Middle East, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
South Yemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Syria	5	5	6	-	3	9	-	2	3	12	24
Tunisia	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	7
Turkey	19	16	2	5	9	13	17	7	7	36	77
UAR - Egypt	20	16	16	1	10	12	9	8	19	49	91
Yemen	2	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	6	6
United Arab Emirates	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.31

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for Middle East, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
Middle East & North Africa	3	-	1	-	3	5	2
Middle East	1	-	-	-	2	-	-
Arabian Peninsula	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Near East	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
All Arab States	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
Aden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Algeria	-	2	-	-	1	-	-
Bahrain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iran	2	2	-	-	1	1	2
Iraq	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Israel	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jordan	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Kuwait	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Libya	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Morocco	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Oman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Qatar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saudia Arabia	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Yemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Syria	1	1	1	-	2	-	-
Tunisia	-	1	-	-	1	2	2

Table F.31 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics
by Country for Middle East, 1976-1981

	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
COUNTRY							
Turkey	-	-	-	-	1	1	-
United Arab Republic	2	2	2	-	5	1	3
Yemen	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
United Arab Emirates	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.32

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science by Country for Middle East, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Middle East & N. Africa	8	1	1	-	5	19	4	4	6	1
Middle East	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Arabian Peninsula	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Near East	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
All Arab States	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Aden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Algeria	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	-
Bahrain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iran	1	-	-	-	8	4	4	-	9	1
Iraq	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
Israel	-	2	-	-	3	6	-	-	-	-
Jordan	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
Kuwait	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Libya	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
Morocco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Oman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Qatar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saudia Arabia	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
South Yemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Syria	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Tunisia	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-
Turkey	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	5	-

Table F.32 (continued)

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics
by Country for Middle East, 1976-1981

COUNTRY		GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL		INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
United Arab Republic	2	-	1	-	4	3	1	2	6	3
Yemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Arab Emirates	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.33

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications by Country for Middle East, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Middle East & North Africa	2	7	14	2	5	5
Middle East	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arabian Peninsula	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Near East	-	-	-	-	-	-
All Arab States	1	-	3	-	2	-
Aden	-	-	-	-	-	-
Algeria	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bahrain	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	2	-	-	-
Iran	-	2	4	1	1	1
Iraq	-	-	-	-	-	-
Israel	-	-	1	-	3	-
Jordan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kuwait	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	-	-	-	-	-	-
Libya	-	-	2	-	-	4
Morocco	-	1	-	1	-	-
Oman	-	-	-	-	-	-
Qatar	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saudia Arabia	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Yemen	-	-	-	-	-	-
Syria	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tunisia	-	2	-	-	-	-
Turkey	-	-	1	-	2	-
United Arab Republic	-	-	6	2	-	1
Yemen	-	-	1	1	-	-
United Arab Emirates	-	-	-	-	-	-

South Asia

Table F.34

Distribution of Publications by Discipline
by Country for South Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
South Asia as a whole	13	5	2	3	9	10	6	19	12	50	64
Afghanistan	2	9	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	7	14
Bangladesh	-	3	4	-	4	2	4	4	2	13	18
Bhutan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	7	2	2	1	2	1	4	11	3	12	26
India	54	52	15	3	54	38	64	114	35	136	324
Maldive Islands	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Nepal	3	-	-	1	-	2	1	1	1	7	8
Pakistan	15	1	1	-	13	8	15	10	10	25	50
Sikkim	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	3

Table F.35

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for South Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
South Asia as a whole	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Afghanistan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bangladesh	-	3	-	-	2	1	-
Bhutan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	-	2	-	-	1	-	-
India	1	8	-	-	6	4	1
Maldive Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nepal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pakistan	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Sikkim	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.36

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science
by Country for South Asia, 1975-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
South Asia as a whole	2	-	-	1	2	4	1	1	3	-
Afghanistan	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
Bangladesh	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
Bhutan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
India	3	6	2	6	11	2	1	2	8	3
Maldive Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nepal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Pakistan	2	2	-	-	5	1	-	-	1	-
Sikkim	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1

Table F.37

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications by Country for South Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
South Asia as a whole	2	1	-	-	6	-
Afghanistan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bangladesh	-	-	-	1	-	-
Bhutan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka	-	-	-	1	-	-
India	1	2	-	2	6	3
Maldive Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nepal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pakistan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sikkim	-	-	-	-	-	-

Southeast Asia

Table F.38

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Southeast Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Southeast Asia as a whole	17	1	9	3	5	3	2	9	9	30	44
Indochina	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	3	4
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burma	-	2	1	-	1	1	1	1	3	6	9
Cambodia	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	2	-	4	12
Indonesia	8	10	1	-	6	10	-	-	7	25	41
Laos	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	2	4
Malaysia	6	-	4	2	2	3	-	-	5	8	14
Philippines	19	-	10	7	4	8	-	-	11	19	50
Portuguese Timor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thailand	8	2	1	1	-	8	1	4	2	14	26
Vietnam	2	-	1	-	2	3	-	1	5	7	11
North Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Vietnam	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1

Table F.39

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for Southeast Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
Southeast Asia as a whole	4	1	2	-	2	1	-
Indochina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burma	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cambodia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesia	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Laos	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malaysia	-	-	-	-	-	3	1
Philippines	1	3	1	2	2	-	1
Portuguese Timor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thailand	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Vietnam	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
North Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.40

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science
by Country for Southeast Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Southeast Asia as a whole	2	-	-	-	2	4	-	-	1	-
Indochina	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burma	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Cambodia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesia	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	3	-
Laos	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malaysia	-	-	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	6	1
Portuguese Timor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thailand	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
Vietnam	-	-	-	-	3	2	1	-	-	-
North Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-

Table F.41

Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications for Southeast Asia, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Southeast Asia as a whole	-	-	-	-	2	-
Indochina	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brunei	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burma	-	1	-	-	-	-
Cambodia	-	-	-	-	1	-
Indonesia	-	-	-	-	1	-
Laos	-	-	-	-	1	-
Malaysia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philippines	-	-	-	-	1	-
Portuguese Timor	-	-	-	-	-	-
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thailand	-	-	-	1	1	1
Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	1
North Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-

Western Europe

Table F.42

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Western Europe, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEOGRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT. SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Europe as a whole	2	6	5	-	29	10	6	11	10	39	73
Western Europe	1	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	5	6
Southern Europe	2	1	3	1	4	-	-	1	1	5	9
Central Europe	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	4	4
Austria	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	1	2	4	5
Belgium	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
Denmark	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
Finland	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	4
France	3	7	-	-	10	5	7	2	4	26	35
Germany as a whole	1	4	1	-	9	1	4	9	12	23	33
West Germany	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	5	5
Great Britain	7	1	6	-	6	2	3	2	6	26	29
Greece	6	5	-	-	5	1	3	-	2	15	22
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	6	6	2	1	5	1	5	2	3	17	23
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	3	-	-	-	1	3	-	2	-	4	7
Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	-	1	2	1	5	7	12	-	6	19	32

Table F.42 (continued)

Distribution of Publications by Discipline by Country for Western Europe, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	ANTHRO/ SOCIOLOGY	ART	ECON	GEO-GRAPHY	HISTORY	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE	RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY	POLIT SCIENCE	NO. OF AUTHORS	NO. OF PUBLICATIONS
Republic of Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1
Northern Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	8	5	2	1	26	3	82	6	20	66	141
Sweden	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Switzerland	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Andorra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gibraltar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Liechtenstein	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monaco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Marino	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vatican City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.43

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Economics by Country for Western Europe, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	RURAL/ AGRICULTURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRIAL	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PLANNING, POLICY	MARKETS
Europe as a whole	1	-	4	-	1	-	-
Western Europe	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Southern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Central Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denmark	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
France	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Germany as a whole	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
West Germany	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Great Britain	1	1	3	-	-	-	1
Greece	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
Republic of Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Sweden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	1	-	-

Table F.44

Subdisciplinary Distribution of Publications on Political Science by Country for Western Europe, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	GENERAL	POLIT. FIGURES	POLIT. PARTIES	ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR	BEHAVIOR IN SOCIETY	FOREIGN POLICY	MILITARY	RESOURCE ALLOCATION	REGIMES	POLIT. LEVELS
Europe as a whole	2	-	1	1	3	1	1	-	1	-
Western Europe	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Southern Europe	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Central Europe	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Austria	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denmark	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
France	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-
Germany as a whole	1	-	-	-	5	-	6	-	3	-
West Germany	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Great Britain	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	3	-
Greece	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-
Republic of Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	1	1	2	3	6	-	1	-	7	1
Sweden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table F.45

Disciplinary Distribution of Miscellaneous Publications by Country for Western Europe, 1976-1981

COUNTRY	COMMUNICATION & JOURNALISM	EDUCATION	SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	PUBLIC HEALTH	LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES	LAW
Europe as a whole	-	2	1	-	-	-
Western Europe	-	1	-	-	-	-
Southern Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-
Central Europe	-	-	-	-	-	-
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denmark	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finland	-	-	-	-	-	-
France	-	1	-	-	-	1
Germany as a whole	1	1	-	-	-	-
West Germany	-	-	-	-	-	-
Great Britain	-	1	1	1	-	-
Greece	1	-	-	-	-	1
Iceland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	1	-	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Republic of Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	-	2	1	-	1	1
Sweden	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	-

G

Grants Awarded Under The Fulbright Program, 1971-84

The following tables were compiled by Anne Carpenter at the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES), affiliated with the American Council on Education. These tabulations show the number of research and other grants awarded under the Fulbright program over a thirteen year period. These data enumerate the proportion of all Fulbright grants that support research abroad as opposed to grants for lectureships, the latter often on technical subjects. The left half of each table shows the number of applications for grants and the right half the actual awards of grants.

In the first table, a summary of the distribution of Fulbright grants "Worldwide," counts exclude Indo-American and Spanish Treaty Scholars.

In all the tables in this appendix, scholars who are engaged in both lecturing and research are counted under lecturing. Only new grants are counted under awards. Percentages are rounded to whole numbers. 1983-84 figures are preliminary.

PROFILE OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS BY CATEGORY

	APPLICATIONS				AWARDS			
	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH
YEAR				WORLDWIDE				
1971-72	1358	391	1749	22%	419	117	536	22%
1972-73	1688	675	2363	29%	434	113	547	21%
1973-74	1862	670	2532	26%	363	131	494	27%
1974-75	1937	796	2733	29%	379	144	523	28%
1975-76	1862	714	2576	28%	374	131	505	26%
1976-77	1905	696	2601	27%	356	122	478	26%
1977-78	1903	568	2471	23%	397	134	531	25%
1978-79	2027	666	2693	25%	436	122	558	22%
1979-80	1722	534	2256	24%	447	130	577	23%
1980-81	1997	541	2538	21%	489	137	626	22%
1981-82	1705	627	2332	27%	494	166	660	25%
1982-83	2077	662	2739	24%	504	193	697	28%
1983-84	1563	871	2434	36%	461	202	663	30%
TOTAL	23606	8411	32017	26%	5553	1842	7395	25%

PROFILE OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS BY CATEGORY

	APPLICATIONS				AWARDS			
	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH
YEAR				AFRICA				
1971-72	67	-	67	0%	22	-	22	0%
1972-73	94	4	98	4%	28	1	29	3%
1973-74	176	-	176	0%	26	-	26	0%
1974-75	117	-	117	0%	27	-	27	0%
1975-76	185	1	186	1%	34	-	34	0%
1976-77	160	-	160	0%	30	-	30	0%
1977-78	146	-	146	0%	34	-	34	0%
1978-79	192	2	194	1%	38	-	38	0%
1979-80	174	2	176	1%	48	1	49	2%
1980-81	151	4	155	3%	37	2	39	5%
1981-82	119	86	205	42%	37	12	49	24%
1982-83	127	45	172	26%	43	15	58	26%
1983-84	167	54	221	24%	49	7	56	13%
TOTAL	1875	198	2073	10%	453	38	491	8%

PROFILE OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS BY CATEGORY

	APPLICATIONS				AWARDS			
	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH
YEAR				AMERICAN REPUBLICS				
1971-72	197	7	204	3%	102	2	104	2%
1972-73	194	14	208	7%	95	3	98	3%
1973-74	194	13	207	6%	76	2	78	3%
1974-75	197	26	223	12%	73	5	78	6%
1975-76	176	24	200	12%	54	5	59	8%
1976-77	168	21	189	11%	44	3	47	6%
1977-78	231	36	267	13%	66	4	70	6%
1978-79	205	77	282	27%	59	11	70	16%
1979-80	204	76	280	27%	74	10	84	12%
1980-81	204	73	277	26%	79	13	92	14%
1981-82	219	58	277	21%	77	11	88	13%
1982-83	269	58	327	18%	73	17	90	19%
1983-84	200	56	256	22%	73	20	93	22%
TOTAL	2658	539	3197	17%	945	106	1051	10%

PROFILE OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS BY CATEGORY

	APPLICATIONS				AWARDS			
YEAR	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH
				EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC				
1971-72	241	96	337	28%	71	26	97	27%
1972-73	314	148	462	32%	81	27	108	25%
1973-74	344	133	447	28%	61	31	92	34%
1974-75	391	130	521	25%	61	28	89	31%
1975-76	422	137	559	25%	63	28	91	31%
1976-77	332	182	514	35%	55	33	88	38%
1977-78	277	175	452	39%	58	42	100	42%
1978-79	278	147	425	35%	68	23	91	25%
1979-80	250	124	374	33%	68	30	98	31%
1980-81	313	109	422	26%	91	31	122	25%
1981-82	334	115	449	26%	86	37	123	30%
1982-83	414	123	537	23%	92	23	115	20%
1983-84	307	173	480	36%	80	31	111	28%
TOTAL	4217	1792	6009	30%	935	390	1325	29%

PROFILE OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS BY CATEGORY

	APPLICATIONS				AWARDS			
	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH
YEAR	EASTERN EUROPE AND USSR							
1971-72	103	18	121	15%	45	8	53	15%
1972-73	138	29	167	17%	53	6	59	10%
1973-74	147	29	176	16%	45	5	50	10%
1974-75	155	19	174	11%	47	6	53	11%
1975-76	148	22	170	13%	46	6	52	12%
1976-77	174	41	215	19%	49	7	56	13%
1977-78	246	24	270	9%	52	6	58	10%
1978-79	235	29	264	11%	58	5	63	8%
1979-80	251	25	276	9%	66	8	74	11%
1980-81	236	21	257	8%	53	6	59	10%
1981-82	198	24	222	11%	60	7	67	10%
1982-83	222	27	249	11%	64	13	77	17%
1983-84	212	50	262	19%	51	25	76	33%
TOTAL	2465	358	2823	13%	689	108	797	14%

PROFILE OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS BY CATEGORY

	APPLICATIONS				AWARDS			
	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH
YEAR	NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA							
1971-72	164	34	198	17%	47	12	59	20%
1972-73	212	48	260	18%	34	7	41	17%
1973-74	212	63	275	23%	37	9	46	20%
1974-75	277	58	335	17%	44	7	51	14%
1975-76	239	71	310	23%	51	5	56	9%
1976-77	221	26	247	11%	49	4	53	8%
1977-78	310	24	334	7%	71	3	74	4%
1978-79	324	15	339	4%	69	4	73	5%
1979-80	200	9	209	4%	55	5	60	8%
1980-81	355	38	393	10%	70	7	77	9%
1981-82	242	91	333	27%	73	19	92	21%
1982-83	359	83	422	19%	69	16	85	19%
1983-84	240	94	334	28%	71	10	81	12%
TOTAL	3355	654	4009	16%	740	108	848	13%

PROFILE OF AMERICAN SCHOLARS BY CATEGORY

	APPLICATIONS				AWARDS			
YEAR	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH	FOR LECTURESHIPS	FOR RESEARCH	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL FOR RESEARCH
	WESTERN EUROPE							
1971-72	586	236	822	29%	132	69	201	34%
1972-73	736	432	1168	37%	143	69	212	33%
1973-74	789	432	1221	35%	118	84	202	42%
1974-75	800	563	1363	41%	127	98	225	44%
1975-76	692	459	1151	40%	126	87	213	41%
1976-77	850	426	1276	33%	129	75	204	37%
1977-78	693	309	1002	31%	116	79	195	41%
1978-79	793	396	1189	33%	144	79	223	35%
1979-80	643	298	941	32%	136	76	212	36%
1980-81	738	296	1034	29%	159	78	237	33%
1981-82	593	253	846	30%	161	80	241	33%
1982-83	686	326	1012	32%	163	109	272	40%
1983-84	437	444	881	50%	137	109	246	44%
TOTAL	9036	4870	13906	35%	1791	1092	2883	38%

H
Summaries of Special Needs of Each World Area Studies Group

Africa
Michael F. Lofchie
University of California at Los Angeles

Eastern Europe and USSR
Herbert J. Ellison
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies

Japan
Robert E. Ward
Stanford University

Latin America
William P. Glade
University of Texas at Austin

The Middle East
R. Bayly Winder
New York University

South Asia
Richard D. Lambert
University of Pennsylvania

Southeast Asia
Gayl D. Ness
University of Michigan

Western Europe
William B. Bader
SRI International

Africa

by

Michael F. Lofchie

Africa has 2,000 languages, many of which have highly differentiated dialects. Selecting which of these languages should be taught on a regular basis, and at what levels, is a formidably difficult problem. Finding the resources to mount an effective program is almost impossible. Many of the key individuals involved in the administration of African language teaching programs would, if pressed to the wall, acknowledge that their resources are stretched beyond razor-thin. We are not doing as good a job of teaching African languages as we should. This is due in part to the sheer immensity of the task, and in part to the lack of language teaching materials in this area.

The preparation of teaching materials--including language tapes and self-paced instructional kits--ought to be a high priority. There is a considerable value in considering whether or not there ought to be some sort of pattern of institutional specialization by languages. Such specialization, especially for the most rare of the less commonly taught languages, already exists de facto to some degree, and is an official policy of the federally funded African area programs for summer intensive instruction.

It would be useful to find some way, as well, to induce university administrations to formulate more explicit policies about the teaching of the less commonly taught languages. For African languages especially, there would be a widespread tendency to drop these courses altogether because of low enrollments, were it not that available federal funds (Title VI) provide an inducement to remain active. African area linguists are often the poor relations in departments of linguistics, which place primary stress on the theoretical aspects of language study. Only two major universities--Wisconsin and Florida--have departments of African languages and literatures. This indicates the low priority that universities, on their own, assign to the teaching of these languages.

At the moment, only schools that receive federal funding offer substantial programs in African languages, and even these universities are typically limiting their offerings in the main to the first-year level of perhaps two or three major languages, and upper and intermediate levels of only one or two. Although there may also be individual or special tutorials in perhaps two or three additional languages, the impact is a severe reduction in our national competency in the languages in this region.

The problem of library development would not seem to be unique to the African area. If we consider, however, the need for primary materials (newspapers, serials, ephemera) in the vernacular languages, then the problem is obviously greater for a continent of 2,000 languages than elsewhere. Library staffs are inadequate, especially when it comes to staff with specialized language skills. Funds for collecting and preservation (microfilming, binding, re-acquisition) are extremely limited. At UCLA, we are able to send our African bibliographer to Africa perhaps one year in three, and then his trip covers only a fraction of the continent. Bibliography development is critically important, especially for certain highly specialized topics and for certain geographical areas.

The tendency to devalue area studies as not up to disciplinary intellectual standards may be a problem common to all foreign language and area fields, but it seems to me to be especially noticeable in the African field. The study of money and banking in the United States is economics; the study of money and banking in Western Europe is economics; but the study of money and banking in Africa is area studies and, axiomatically, a lesser intellectual species. Similar analogies could be drawn for almost any other discipline, including many in the humanities.

The result of this value system has been a tendency in many departments to shy away from hiring in area fields. For example, if an authority on the peoples and culture of Africa retires or resigns, the departmental search for a replacement is typically posted in terms of a "quantitative" anthropologist or "physical" anthropologist. This illustrates the way in which the movement toward methodologism tends to occur at the expense of genuinely international offerings. In the context of the steady state university, the replacement of area-skilled persons with persons whose primary identity is methodologically defined takes a terrible intellectual toll. If we take seriously the notion that our mandate is to lobby for programs that provide our students with a window on the world, it might be wise to formulate a carefully and defensibly worded statement on this trend.

Eastern Europe and USSR

by

Herbert J. Ellison

Until recently, the general picture for both Russian and East European studies has been bleak--diminishing financial support from private and public funds; severely limited opportunities in the academy and elsewhere for Ph.D. specialists; reduced and declining enrollments in both language and area studies courses in colleges and universities; and a steady reduction of academic positions in many social science departments where places vacated by Russian specialists were claimed for other purposes.

During the past two years, many aspects of the situation have improved for Russian studies, though not for East European studies. Some of the major private foundations--notably Rockefeller and Mellon--have shown renewed interest in Russian studies and have made major grants for their support. Congress has passed a bill authorizing $5 million per year for ten years for Soviet and East European studies, an action intended mainly to support "national institutions" in the field, examples of which are given in the Conference Committee report (published with the legislation) as the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), the National Council for Soviet and East European Research (NCSEER), and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and its Kennan Institute. These initiatives should be particularly helpful for strengthening foreign policy studies (Rockefeller) and some of the major Russian studies centers (Mellon), and for the development of the institutions servicing Russian studies nationwide. There remain, however, a number of very important problems.

One of the continuing needs is to build a more durable financial foundation for the major Russian and East European studies centers, and to support Russian and East European studies in American higher education. For the major Russian and East European studies centers, one of the primary components of support that needs strengthening and expansion is Title VI of the Higher Education Act, currently under review.

Funding under the Title VI program has not kept pace with inflation. This has made it difficult for the centers to sustain or develop offerings of many, or even most, of the languages of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It has also meant inadequate support of acquisitions and personnel for major library collections. This item is particularly crucial in the Russian and East European field, and more expensive than for most other area studies fields traditionally supported within the Title VI program. There have also been inadequate funds for supporting faculty positions for the teaching of special topics in area studies, and for innovation in the curriculum.

Though the Title VI program plays a relatively minor role in the overall funding of area studies programs, in crucial areas--critical languages, libraries, fellowships, faculty foreign travel--the Title VI program has often provided a very high proportion of the financial support. For younger scholars, the expansion of the Title VI program could provide more teaching opportunities within the major centers of Russian and East European studies. The future strength and quality of the major centers will therefore be much affected by the decisions on the current review of the Title VI program.

Another major problem in Russian and East European studies has been the shortage of support for research, particularly for younger specialists, and the shortage of attractive academic positions to justify the long-term preparatory commitment of participants. There is no doubt that there will have to be more money spent on providing research fellowships of at least one academic year for young specialists. This means the opportunity to use the major library resources and to maintain contact with other specialists. Besides the research opportunities provided by IREX for overseas research, which seem to be adequate, more opportunities are needed in the major American centers for Russian and East European studies. It would also be valuable to have some mechanism for supporting, at least on a developmental basis, the establishment and maintenance of positions for teaching in smaller colleges and universities. This seed money approach can often be very helpful for introducing new faculty positions and establishing the utility of new curricula.

A number of other special problems are apparent in Russian and East European studies. One is the shortage of people in some vital areas of study. There is still a serious shortage of specialists on the national minorities of the Soviet Union, particularly those of the Transcaucasus and Central Asia. There is also a shortage of people trained in the minority languages, especially those of Central Asia. There is a shortage of specialists on many areas of Soviet foreign policy, and a shortage of people working in major areas of Soviet history, of sociology, economics, and other disciplines. The shortage is even more striking when one looks at the field of East European studies, where the attrition in recent years verges on disaster.

Hence the planning for the future in both Russian and East European studies needs to give considerable attention to the weaknesses of particular fields. One also needs to examine the ways in which fellowship opportunities, new academic positions, and support resources can be added, and to consider other measures that can be undertaken to strengthen the overall position of both Russian and East European studies in American higher education.

The pressures of the job market have encouraged a number of initiatives, both within academic institutions and outside, to broaden the base of employment opportunities for students in the field of Russian and East European studies--certainly a central concern if the field is to be strong. These have included ties with professional schools and programs inside the universities that make it possible for students to combine area studies with work on a professional degree. Unfortunately, the economic relations between the USSR and Eastern Europe and the United States do not provide many opportunities in the business field, and opportunities have been limited elsewhere. Aside from education, government employment continues to provide the greatest number of opportunities, and it is important that recent studies of language and area instruction stress the vital need for quality language instruction and the standardization of language programs. The evidence is that the colleges and universities have not satisfied government clients with the quality of their training programs and the competency level of their graduates.

The national institutions for Russian studies may well have new opportunities to serve more effectively with the passage of the new federal legislation and increased foundation benefits. For IREX and the National Council, the need has been for more adequate and stable funding so that exchange programs and general research support could be developed more effectively. The revival of the Joint Committee on Soviet Studies promises to provide an important source of new initiatives in research in the field. Also, the planned expansion of the Kennan Institute promises to extend the program of research fellowships, publications, seminars, and conferences, and to increase access to the library and other resources of Washington, D.C. The plan for adding a European Program with an East European dimension in the Wilson Center will help to provide the kind of support for East European studies now provided for Russian studies by the Kennan Institute. Finally, the revival and reorganization of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, and its close cooperation with the other national organizations in Slavic studies, has been an important part of the recent refurbishment of national organizations in the Russian and East European studies field.

Japan

by

Robert E. Ward

Japanese studies is uniquely fortunate as an area field in that it can draw financial support from not only American but also Japanese sources, and can do this in amounts that are extraordinary by comparison with the funding available for other major area fields. In considerable measure, the quality of the teaching and research being conducted in the field reflects and is a function of these happy financial circumstances. So far as I can tell, there has been little drop-off in the numbers of graduate students applying for admission to doctoral programs in Japanese studies. The question of the quality of these candidates is, as in all other fields, moot. While I think that we are continuing to get respectable quality, my own opinion is that there has been an appreciable loss. My observation is the common one, that the best minds are going into more lucrative professions.

If one were to include those who pursue studies in the Japanese area and then elect careers in the federal government, I would be even less sanguine. I believe that the state of the professional Japanese service within the federal agencies has more or less continuously declined since the days when Ed Reischauer was Ambassador to Japan. The reasons are well known: a very low ceiling on promotional possibilities, frequent assignment to non-Japan-related positions, and the generally low morale that characterizes federal service these days. This is, I think, a very serious problem.

Looking at the field of Japanese studies in terms of what should be done under federal or other auspices, I would suggest that it might be regarded as a model for other fields and their related world areas. While relatively well off, there are a number of purposes for which Japanese studies could legitimately and constructively use additional funds. High among these would be library purposes. I would also like to see some sort of consistent effort to develop additional employment opportunities for Japanese specialists in the private and the not-for-profit sectors.

Latin America

by

William P. Glade

While there is no reason to consider Spanish instruction an endangered academic species, the same cannot be said for the other major linguistic prop in Latin American area studies. On most campuses, Portuguese--despite the evident political, military, commercial, and cultural importance of Brazil--leads a precarious existence, especially in terms of course enrollments beyond the elementary level. As a consequence, there are few teaching assistantships to support graduate-level students in Portuguese, and by and large even the regular faculty must often, where enrollment minima are enforced, cast about for ways of filling out their teaching load.

It goes without saying that the position of Portuguese, marginal even on major university campuses, is generally worse still at smaller universities. From this it follows that, for the foreseeable future, special financing ought to be made available to underwrite a suitably broad range of offerings in Portuguese language and Brazilian literature and civilization, as a highly desirable but far from self-supporting complement in each of the major Latin American studies programs, including a fair number of those that do not now receive federal center support.

Such support could constructively take the form of partial salary support for teaching faculty, research assistantships for graduate student maintenance, and funding for frequent special multidisciplinary events and activities designed to call the attention of the wider campus community to the continuing importance of knowledge of Brazil. Funding, in the form of fellowships and instructional salaries, is also needed for intensive Portuguese summer programs to serve the needs of students from campuses where Portuguese is not offered on any regular basis.

If the situation of Portuguese is lamentable, the case of indigenous languages is worse yet, for here the problem of small enrollments is often compounded by the difficulty of securing a suitable departmental home for the instructional staff. Although the need for indigenous languages is fairly restricted, such need is critical in certain areas of scholarship and, to a lesser degree, in some professional areas. It would seem appropriate social policy, therefore, for support to be provided for the indefinite future in such forms as instructional salary support (partial or entire), wages for native informants, financing the further development of tape libraries, and, of course, salaries and fellowships for intensive summer programs. At least the major federally funded Latin American area centers need to be subsidized in these ways to ensure regular offerings of Quechua, Guarani, Maya, and Nahuatl--with other Amerind languages available on a more occasional and less comprehensive basis.

The well-known Latin American population explosion has been accompanied by another, no less impressive explosion over the past two or three decades: the extraordinary flowering of Latin American scholarship. Many new research institutes have come into being, both inside and outside the universities--which have themselves increased in number; many more governmental reports and other documents of value are being issued; and the number of good young and middle-aged scholars is now several times what it was only a generation back. All this is reflected in an outpouring of publications, many of which, however, are not readily identified, located, and obtained by the usual book distribution channels. Bibliographic control is particularly deficient with respect to government publications, the near-print items issued from new research centers, and tapes of survey research data. There is, therefore, a growing need for more frequent and longer acquisition trips to the field by Latin American bibliographers from the major research collections.

Lastly, it is imperative that a substantially larger amount of funding be forthcoming to enable Latin America area specialists of all vintages to get to the field more frequently for short research stays of from two weeks to three months. The maturation of the Latin American scholarly infrastructure has made this kind of field trip increasingly feasible, especially when collaborative research is involved, while the building up of the principal research collections in this country has also enhanced the feasibility of these shorter stays, including making a series of relatively short trips on a single project. Thus, what some decades ago might have been viewed as unproductive forays have come to be, for these and other reasons, an optimal type of research plan in many cases today. Moreover, a pattern of research support on this basis would serve to maintain the area skills of our substantial accumulation of specialized human capital, and this is, from all the evidence, a much wiser marginal expenditure these days than would be new human capital formation on any considerable scale.

The Middle East

by

R. B. Winder

The Middle East, as an area of study, shares its difficulties and rewards with those encountered in the study of other lesser developed regions of the world. In general, studies of these Third World regions differ from those of developed areas such as Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and Japan, but this summary will focus on special characteristics of the Middle Eastern field.

The problem of research access for students and faculty is increasing--Iran and South Yemen are completely closed, and various other countries are becoming more difficult to enter. It is not far-fetched to suggest that, if present trends persist, social science research will become restricted to a handful of countries. Humanities and pre-modern studies, which will certainly be less restricted, may increasingly become the research fields on which the U.S. academy will be forced to rely for first-hand knowledge of the Middle East.

A second problem of Middle Eastern studies is the end of the ten-to-fifteen-year "gold rush" ushered in by the October/Ramadan Arab-Israeli war of 1973, with the subsequent steep hikes in the price of oil. Since that date, many universities have benefited from the generosity of major U.S. oil and other companies, and of oil-affluent agencies and individuals in the Middle East. The fall of the shah and the oil glut and consequent decline in real oil prices over the last couple of years all indicate that Middle Eastern and corporate American donations to Middle Eastern language and area studies are likely to decline at least proportionately to oil income. As a specific indicator, one can mention that the U.S. Department of Commerce now (March 1984) reports that exports from the U.S. to OPEC countries have declined by $6 billion (22.9 to 16.9) from 1982 to 1983. Thus, federal support for all aspects of Middle Eastern studies will be much more crucial in the coming decade or so than it has been in the past, when other donations have been able to cushion the general problems.

A third special aspect of the Middle Eastern field is its languages. In theory, there are only four "major" (Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, and Turkish) languages plus three "minor" (Armenian, Berber, and Kurdish) ones--with Arabic as, overwhelmingly, the one with the broadest (some 19-plus countries) sweep. But this formulation, for Arabic in particluar, is grossly misleading. Few persons in the world, including Arabs, "know" Arabic in the sense that they can read easily anything written in the language or speak with people everywhere across the 19 countries. Written Arabic varies from older, and more literary forms (which are necessary to know) to newer, more journalistic forms (which are also necessary). And all written Arabic differs very markedly from all spoken Arabic.

In addition, spoken Arabic varies widely from country to country and within countries. Distinct dialectical differences between villages a few kilometers apart or between ethnic groups in the same city are more of a rule than an exception. The result is that, for students of this language, truly significantly more time must be allowed than for other languages to acquire even a modest ability to carry on ordinary dealings in it.

The problems of Arabic raise, at least, the issue of whether or not more training centers like the highly valuable Center for Arabic Study Abroad (CASA), which operates primarily through the American University in Cairo, should be established in other major dialect areas such as North Africa--especially Morocco--and in the lower Iraq/Gulf area.

The widespread geography of Arabic also suggests that library funds should be particularly large for works in this language--especially in terms of official publications. Nineteen (for 19 countries) official gazettes, 19 law codes, and 19 sets of newspapers give some symbolic idea of the magnitude of the problems involved.

South Asia

by

Richard D. Lambert

Most of the problems described in the body of this report apply to South Asian studies. Along with the rapid development of language and area studies in general, and in part reflecting the period of high American interest in economic development in South Asian countries, there was a major expansion in the number of programs, students, and specialists in the 1960s and 1970s. However, as in the other area studies groups, this growth was uneven.

Under the broad rubric of South Asian studies, the overwhelming proportion of specialists and students concentrated on India, as against Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, and the Himalayan states--Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim. All of these countries are technically within the domain of South Asian studies, but only India and, to a lesser extent Pakistan, are well represented in the teaching and research about South Asia. Even the set of scholars who used to spend time in several of the countries of the region, and thus had area-wide skills, have tended to give way to country-specific competencies. Moreover, in studies of India itself, there has developed a tradition of region-specific rather than national-level competencies, and there has been an increase in the proportion of scholars studying South India; formerly, most scholars concentrated on the northern half of the sub-continent.

This growing country and region specialization has in part been the result of the growth of a set of professional standards increasingly accepted throughout the field. Even though English is still widely used in the sub-continent, recognized South Asia specialists must now have a command of the language of the area in which they are working. This standard was not so widely accepted a decade ago. One consequence of this development is that since each region of the sub-continent has its own language, pan-regional specialists are increasingly rare.

While the generally recognized norm is that South Asian area specialists should have a competency in one of the languages of the country, the levels of competency in those languages of many specialists tends to be low. Younger scholars tend to have a higher level of language competency than many of their elders, but even among them, near-native fluency is uncommon.

In more general terms, using the language development continuum outlined in the preceding report, South Asian studies is still relatively underdeveloped. Many students would be rated well below the Foreign Service Institute level 2 at the end of their training, often even after a language learning sojourn in one of the countries of South Asia. The teaching materials and formal instructional programs tend to be limited to the early stages of language acquisition; the teaching materials are few, mostly unpolished and unpublished; and there is little, if any, research or even collective discussion about which training system works best for what kinds of students. The development of a normed proficiency test has just begun for one language--Hindi; there is one reinforcement and upgrading program during the summer for established scholars in Hindi, and one is about to be established for Tamil. Otherwise, the style and level of language teaching has changed relatively little over the past several decades. Moreover, there is very little centralized planning and few resources available to upgrade the level of language instruction.

South Asian studies shares with African studies the problem that a large number of important languages are spoken in the area; there are 14 official languages and many more if one counts those languages that lie on the borderline between a dialect and a fully differentiated language. Most organized programs teach Hindi and perhaps one other South Asian language. A substantial number of important languages, each spoken by as many people as most European languages, are taught nowhere. Moreover, enrollments in South Asian languages are declining in general, putting a great deal of pressure on universities to reduce the number of South Asian languages they are teaching. As a result, a number of the South Asian languages that are currently being offered are being dropped by one program after another.

Our nation's resource base for teaching South Asian languages has never been very strong, and the little capacity we have had in the past is rapidly eroding. There are a number of experienced and dedicated teachers of South Asian languages, but the field as a whole could benefit from a major infusion of resources and a collective effort to move ahead to the level of language instruction available in Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese.

On the area studies side, popular interest in South Asia as well as official interest in terms of strategic importance or technical assistance has declined. So have student enrollments and the number of fresh entrants into the field. This has had the consequences indicated in this report. The intra-institutional economic pressures have begun to erode program strength, and a number of smaller and middle-level programs have been disbanded entirely. The applied and professional disciplines, formerly brought into the field by our nation's extensive technical-assistance programs, are no longer engaged with the South Asian countries to the same degree. South Asian studies has never developed a substantial body of scholars whose specialty is the foreign affairs of South Asian countries or those countries' relationships with the United States. Those scholars that do write on these matters tend not to be specialists on such matters. There is only one academic specialist on military affairs in South Asia. The field is undergoing a major process of "humanitization"; that is, the social sciences--particularly the quantitative and theoretically oriented social sciences--are dropping away, so that the center of gravity is shifting into the humanities, and within the humanities, those dealing with earlier time periods are predominant. Moreover, compared with a decade ago, there are relatively few ongoing projects of very substantial scale--most research is individual and is sustained by fellowship support.

A cross-sectional examination and targeted strategy for the future development of the field is long overdue. Unfortunately, the collective mechanisms for planning are not strong; neither the Joint Committee of the Social Science Research Council/American Council of Learned Societies, nor the relevant committees of the Association for Asian Studies has the resources and staffing to play such a role. The one organization that has a sufficiently representative membership to play an internal planning role, the American Institute of Indian Studies--virtually all of the organized programs teaching South Asian studies are represented on its Board of Directors--by and large confines its activities to the administration of its programs in India. There is an equivalent organization, the American Institute of Pakistan Studies, that provides fellowships for research in that country.

The field is facing two major shocks within the next two years, both of them related to the exhaustion of the excess currency fund of rupees administered under PL 480. For several decades, Indian studies has benefited immensely from the activities, supported by PL 480, of the American Institute of Indian Studies. These activities include a major fellowship program both for senior scholars and for dissertation-year research and language training for students, a massive photographic archive of Indian architecture, an archive of Indian musical performance, and a seminar and publication program. The institute also negotiates access to research sites and university affiliations for American scholars. If this organization were to disappear, the most important collective activities in South Asian studies would disappear with it. The exhaustion of the excess currency fund puts the institute in great jeopardy.

The second major activity that is in imminent danger of collapse is the PL 480-supported library acquisition program, administered by the Library of Congress. Under this program, all books and serials published in India are acquired and catalogued by a staff resident in New Delhi. The major South Asian studies centers in the United States select the portion of those acquisitions that they wish to receive, largely free of cost. When this program expires, a major new acquisition and cataloguing program for the field, supported in the main from the centers' own funds, will have to be developed.

These and other developments in the field call for a massive collective planning effort to chart development for the coming decades.

Southeast Asia

by

Gayl D. Ness

Although the Southeast Asian region is highly attractive to American universities for both practical and scholarly reasons, there are special conditions that pose obstacles to American universities in promoting Southeast Asian studies. There are three problem areas, which identify major needs for this area of study. They are the language mix, variable access to the field, and the humanities.

With a population of only about one-third of a billion people, Southeast Asia nevertheless has at least five major languages (Burmese, Thai, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Indonesian-Malay). One could easily add more: Khmer, Lao, and Cebuano, as well as other less used tribal languages. These are, to be sure, problems the area shares with South Asia and Africa, but they are also ones from which the Japan, China, and Latin America specialists can consider themselves relieved. The most direct implications of this problem for U.S. area studies are low enrollments and high-cost language instruction. Even at major research universities with substantial graduate programs, we can never expect more than a handful of students to be enrolled in any language course. There is an additional burden in this, however, that deans seldom recognize. Language instruction must be given at two to four different levels. I believe this implies a minimum of two language faculty members to provide the full range of instruction needed for any language. When Southeast Asian language faculty are lodged in a department such as linguistics, this implies that each must provide four levels of language training on what is essentially a half-time appointment. With the best will in the world, there is little prospect of having even major research universities provide the full support needed for language training out of their usually strained budgets. Federal support for sustained language training is imperative.

But federal support must be more flexible than it has been, and the language community must move toward greater rationalization in the provision of language training. This year, for the first time, federal support is being made available for a collective effort to mount a single Southeast Asian Studies Summer Institute (SEASSI). The major Southeast Asia centers have agreed on a rotating schedule, which will place summer institutes at a series of universities over the next few years. Each year the SEASSI will provide six or more languages in intensive ten-week courses. This makes it possible to cover an entire academic year on any level during the intensive summer course, which can considerably reduce the costs of multi-level language training at any university. It will also, we believe, provide a far better environment for language training than can normally be obtained when language is taught along with other courses in a normal academic year.

We believe that this is an effective solution to some of the problems of low enrollment, high-cost language instruction. It may be about as far as we can go at the moment, but it will be useful both to monitor this new effort, and to induce language faculty to consider more and better efforts to provide support for similar innovations. One major constraint is the need for a stable institutional home for language faculty and language training. We cannot put language faculty in cold storage for the rest of the year and simply take them out for the summer institutes. Thus some combination of support for regular academic year teaching together with summer institutes seems a good all-round solution.

We must also, however, consider other solutions. One might be to provide funds for language study abroad, in the region. With appropriate financial assistance, the language community could readily develop suitable contacts with Southeast Asian institutions to house American students for a term or year abroad for more intensive language training. Money will be needed, of course, for this will often mean that students in a discipline will have to take a term or year from their regular studies to intensify their language training.

In addition to the language mix of Southeast Asia, there is also the problem of variable accessibility. In the early 1950s, Burma and Indonesia were in the ascendancy and were highly accessible to foreign scholars. The Indochinese states were opening and within the decade received many new American area scholars. Malaya and the Philippines were in deep trouble with internal insurgencies, and some observers did not give them much hope for continued openness. Today that pattern has changed drastically. Vietnam, Kampuchea, and Laos are quite closed to foreign scholarly research; Burma is open only selectively. It appears that the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries are quite open for field work, but everywhere there are increasing central controls over field research, and it would be foolish to predict no change in accessibility over the next decade.

Access to field research is necessary for the maintenance of serious area scholarship. When the field is closed, there is an important reduction in the attraction necessary to bring a constant supply of new young students into the field. Southeast Asia will continue for some time to be plagued with problems of access. There is little that can be done about this in the region, but there are important steps to be taken in the United States to assure the continued flow of new students into the area despite periods of non-access to the field.

The solution to the problem at this time has been a relatively easy and inexpensive one, and we could give some consideration to continuing it. The Association for Asian Studies (AAS) has a small grants program to support the scholarly meetings of its country committees. For example, Burmese studies remains alive today because a small group of scholars with AAS support continues to meet to present papers and exchange views and ideas. Increasing support to the AAS for its country committees appears to be a good idea. It has an additional advantage to recommend it. As we saw in the case of Vietnam, when an area becomes strategically significant, it becomes somewhat fashionable. This would not be a disadvantage, except that the fashion tends to support policy and strategy-relevant issues, and to neglect other important issues. The maintenance of country committees can help to sustain a broad base of interest in a country and in the variety of issues that do not at any one time appear so policy-relevant.

Finally, there is the issue of the role of the humanities in Southeast Asian studies. Southeast Asia is not unique in this respect, but humanistic studies are clearly crucial for a broader and deeper understanding of the region. One can far better understand Indonesian policy and politics, as well as a broad range of social and economic conditions, if one understands the structure of gamelan music, and the dramatization of the wayang. Vietnamese literature, poetry, and music offer deep insights into that nation, which we too often neglected during our rush of Vietnamese studies. An understanding of Thai and Burmese life and its issues is greatly enhanced by familiarity with Buddhism and its history in the region.

These are, of course, instrumental arguments for the support of the humanities. We would not by any means wish to overemphasize these or to use them exclusively. There are good reasons for humanistic studies in their own right, as integral parts of international or area studies. Nonetheless, we have all experienced the rise of hard-headed questions of utility in area studies, and would be well advised to recognize the weight of utilitarian arguments for humanistic studies. They abound in Southeast Asia. Without the humanities, our area studies would be truncated and half blind.

Western Europe

by

William B. Bader

The cohesion and strength of U.S.-European relations have been the bedrock of U.S. foreign and national security policy since the end of World War II. Today, despite the shared roots and values of democracy and pluralism, the transatlantic relationship is in serious disarray.

The problem goes beyond mutual irritation and recrimination. More and more, there is a sense abroad that the two sides are not on the same wavelength and are not communicating effectively. The steady movement west and south of the American political and commercial center of gravity has involved a shift in the agenda of American domestic and international priorities. Europe has simply been receding from center stage, and far fewer Americans today endeavor to understand the intricacies of European affairs than twenty years ago.

In Europe, at the same time, the transition from the era of economic boom and political consensus in the 1970s to the economic and strategic uncertainties of today has accelerated mistrust of U.S. policy and American behavior. Moreover, few Europeans can be said to know much about American motivating drives, U.S. history, and the nature of the American political process. In short, this is a period of increasing ignorance and parochialism on both sides, precisely when Western unity, understanding, and communication are more than ever needed for global stability.

It is not surprising that in a recent statement to a congressional committee, Admiral B.R. Inman, former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and former head of the National Security Agency, stated that some of our key problems derive from "the lack of deep understanding of (foreign) societies, what motivates them, and how they are changing." And, he added: "I believe we are moving into an increasingly hazardous time."

The general point needs to be underscored. Current frictions within the West are not just "more of the same." A growing part of West European opinion, primarily outside government, but within government as well, is bewailing the lack of transatlantic understanding, and even of genuine interest in learning. It is, in fact, beginning to express the view that U.S. and European policy differences reflect divergent ends and not merely disagreements over means. This view is intensified by a declining European respect for American political institutions and practices, and by the fear of an American return to isolationism or a future collision with the Soviet Union. Regardless of the degree to which this mood may be justified, it is widespread and growing. The steady erosion of trust, the lagging European dependence on American political and intellectual leadership, and the pervasive European criticism of the United States tend, in turn, to reinforce American irritation with and lack of interest in the Europeans. Within this overall contest, the U.S. drift toward a more pronounced superficiality of knowledge and comprehension of European affairs becomes a matter of critical concern.

West European area studies in the United States differs from other area studies in several important respects. Unlike other regional fields, it was not the product of the post-World War II crash development programs spawned by the sudden exigencies of global responsibility and the Soviet challenge. Western Europe, by and large, was excluded from the government-academia-foundation consortium efforts in the late 1940s and the 1950s which focused mainly on areas--Soviet, East European, Asian, and others--that were considered to be exotic, and to involve critical national security policy interests. Since the principal languages, national histories, and literatures of the Continent had been part of the American liberal education curriculum at the leading universities even before World War I, there seemed to be no special need. Moreover, with millions of American servicemen and tourists crisscrossing the Atlantic, it was assumed that this ongoing exposure would suffice to generate and maintain the requisite level of American interest as well as expertise on Western Europe. So long as the West Europeans were seen as friends (compliant ones at that), not foes or even potential commercial competitors, the critical impetus of "advancing U.S. national security interests" was lacking. The field was thus allowed to look after itself, and languish.

For all these reasons, today, with a sense of crisis in the air, the challenge facing West European studies in the United States transcends mere budgetary and structural dimensions. It also calls for a reexamination and reformulation of some of the major premises that governed the American approach, political as well as cultural, toward European affairs in the past. The renewal of European area studies, however, cannot be accomplished in the face of a dwindling pool of national talent and expertise, both in training and in research, and the resulting decrease in U.S. analytical capacity relative to European affairs.

The problem is compounded by the aversion in the social sciences to area studies. As the social sciences have become more technical and quantitative, they have become less interested in encouraging exchanges of knowledge between social science disciplines and humanistic studies. The understanding of any society, America included, requires more than an analysis of how the economy works, how pressure groups function, or how a particular literary movement evolved. Each is only one of the elements that everywhere drive the engines of change within the larger context of enduring traditions, values, modes, and world views.

The problems of U.S.-West European studies are exacerbated by the fact that most of the energies are invested in the study of the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, to the neglect of the countries of Northern and Southern Europe. Even Italy is grossly understudied. As former Ambassador Richard Gardner put it in a recent article in the New York Times, "The academic community has only three of four people who really justify as experts on contemporary Italy. I know of none in the United States government." The same applies to Norway, Austria, Greece, Spain, and Portugal. This makes it nearly impossible to deal with "Europe" as an entity when it does behave as one, as it has in recent years--for example, with respect to the political-economic management of East-West relations and certain Third World problems. It also reduces the U.S. capability of anticipating both "European" and discrete national responses to oncoming developments.

Furthermore, the depth and soundness of U.S. comprehension of European affairs are seriously impaired by inadequacies in language offerings and training. The point has been stressed elsewhere and need not be addressed here. It is enough to say that without an adequate cadre of linguistically proficient analysts of Europe, especially those skilled in the languages of the less populous West European states, the extent and results of research in this field will perforce be inadequate.

There are three other points to keep in mind: French, Spanish, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Dutch are languages used in various parts of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (German and French are also extensively used in Eastern Europe), and have, therefore, a utility that goes far beyond Europe. Another point is that the many Europeans who speak and read English are able to communicate with anyone in the United States, while the universe of American contacts in Europe is generally limited to the educated English-speaking elite and excludes the majority of the population. Finally, experience shows that the flow of American tourists to Europe has had no more than a marginal effect on our language proficiency and, indeed, on our understanding of the currents and undercurrents that animate European politics and life. The stakes today for both the United

States and Europe are too high to continue ignoring the problem, especially as a new generation of political, economic, and cultural leaders on both continents moves into positions of responsibility.

In 1980, there were over 1,000 non-governmental, nonprofit U.S. institutions engaged in research and training in the field of international relations. Of these, 80% are university-related; the remainder are independent nonprofit institutions engaged in research, public education, or policy advocacy. One-third of the institutions deal with Asia and about one-fourth with Latin America. The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe receive only a little more attention than Africa and the Middle East. Western Europe is at the bottom of the list. Of the approximately 500 existing area studies centers, only 4.3% are focused on Western Europe, as compared with 33.2% on Latin America; 12.4% on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; and 9.3% each on Africa and the Middle East.

In terms of funding, the average revenue (1980 dollars) for West European centers declined from $181,000 in 1970, to $149,000 in 1975, to $61,000 in 1980. During the same decade, the average revenue for Asian studies centers rose from $278,000 to $331,000, and for Middle East centers from $361,000 to $619,000. For specifically university-affiliated West European area centers, the picture is even worse. From 1970 to 1980, average revenue declined by 94.4% while that of Middle Eastern studies rose by 77.4% and Asian studies by 15.8%.

This trend has, of course, been reflected in both the quantitative and the qualitative state of knowledge. The difficulties range from the size of the available manpower pool, to questions of intellectual vigor and morale. Senior academic figures of the past are not being replaced. The successor generation, especially in the critical social sciences, is avoiding making a commitment to a field that is widely perceived to be undernourished. The problem is less immediate in departments of language and literature, though it applies to them as well. Overall, there are simply not enough linguistically equipped people devoting themselves to the study and analysis of the countries of Western Europe.

The need, of course, is not limited to enlarging and stimulating the community of specialists within the university world. It exists outside academe as well, in the press, the corporate sector, and government. Any build-up will require both recruitment and training, perhaps even retraining, of talented individuals. It will also require broadening and solidifying the institutional bases of West European programs in the United States.

I

Members of Project Team

RESEARCH TEAM

Project Director:
Dr. Richard D. Lambert
South Asia Regional Studies
University of Pennsylvania

Research Coordinator:
Dr. Margaret B. Merrill
Association of American
Universities

Senior Researchers:
Dr. Elinor G. Barber
Institute of
International
Education

Dr. Eleanor Jorden
Modern Languages and
Linguistics
Cornell University

Dr. Leon Twarog
Director, Center for
Russian and East
European Studies
Ohio State University

PROJECT MANAGER
Dr. John C. Crowley
Association of American Universities

STEERING COMMITTEE

Chairman, Steering Committee
Dr. Irving Shain, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dr. Herbert J. Ellison, Secretary
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
Smithsonian Institution

Dr. William P. Glade, Director
Institute of Latin American Studies
University of Texas, Austin

Dr. Michael F. Lofchie, Director
African Studies Center
University of California, Los Angeles

Dr. Gayl D. Ness
Southeast Asian Studies Center
Director, Program for Population Planning
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Robert L. Payton, President
Exxon Education Foundation
New York, New York

Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, President
Social Science Research Council
New York, New York

Dr. Robert E. Ward, Director
Center for Research on International Studies
Stanford University

Dr. R. Bayly Winder
Kevorkian Center for Near Eastern Studies
New York University

Bibliography

Agency for International Development. "Information Sheet on A.I.D. Joint Career Corps." Washington, DC: Agency for International Development, 1983.

Automation, Cooperation, and Scholarship: East Asian Libraries in the 1980s. n.p.: Automated Library Information Systems, 1981.

Barber, Elinor G., and Ilchman, Warren. "International Studies Review." New York: The Ford Foundation, 1979.

Bennett, Wendell. Area Studies in American Universities. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951.

Berryman, Sue E.; Langer, Paul F.; Pincus, John; and Solomon, Richard H. Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy. Prepared for the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1979.

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

Brod, Richard I., ed. "Language Study for the 1980s: Reports for the MLA-ACLS Language Task Forces." New York: Modern Language Association, 1980.

_________. Survey of Foreign Language Course Registrations in U.S. Colleges and Universities, Fall 1980. New York: Modern Language Association, 1982.

Carroll, John B. The Teaching of French as a Foreign Language in Eight Countries. International Studies in Evaluation, V. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Clark, John L. D., and Johnson, Dora E. A Survey of Materials Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages in the United States. Submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Division of Advanced Training and Research, International Education Programs. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1982.

Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action. A Report to the Secretary of Education by the National Advisory Board on International Education Programs. James B. Holderman, Chairman. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. December, 1983.

Deagle, Edwin A. A Survey of United States Institutions Engaged in International Relations Research and Related Activities: A Preliminary Report. New York: The Rockefeller Foundation International Relations Division, 1981

Eason, Warren W. "A Dynamic Inventory of Soviet and East European Studies in the United States." Presented under the auspices of the Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, Inc., forthcoming.

H.R. Report 97-749, Conference Report on DOD Authorization Act of 1983, Dated August 16, 1982, pg. 123.

Hall, Robert B. Area Studies with Special Reference to Their Application for Research in the Social Sciences. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947.

Hart, John. "Tongue Tied...." The Times Higher Educational Supplement (London), 9 September 1983, p. 9.

Kassof, Allen H., ed. "Report of the Task Force on National Manpower Targets for Advanced Research on Foreign Areas." New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1981.

Lambert, Richard D. Language and Area Studies Review. Monograph 17. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973.

Lambert, Richard D.; Baxter, Craig; Dimock, Edward; Embree, Ainslee T.; Ilchman, Warren; Talbot, Phillips; Veit, Lawrence; Weiner, Myron; and Moore, Sarah Jane. "National Target for South Asia Specialists." New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1981.

Library Resources for International Education. A Report submitted by the Task Force on Library and Information Resources to the Government/Academic Interface Committee International Education Project, American Council on Education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1975.

McCaughey, Robert, International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning. New York: Columbia University Press, forthcoming.

McDonnell, Lorraine M.; with Stasz, Cathleen; and Madison, Rodger. Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Education. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983.

Merkx, Gilbert W. "The National Need for Latin American and Caribbean Specialists: Current Resources and Future Requirements." New York: The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1983.

Müller, Kurt E. "National Security and Language Competencies: U.S. Armed Forces and Transnational Communication." Master's thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 1983.

A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. A Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. David P. Gardner, Chairman. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, April, 1983.

Prewitt, Kenneth. Introduction to *Social Science Research Council Annual Report*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1982.

RLG in Brief. Stanford, CA: The Research Libraries Group, Inc., 1983.

Ruchti, James R. "The U.S. Government Employment of Foreign Area and International Studies Specialists." *Background Papers and Studies* [*Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*] Washington, DC.: The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1979.

Schneider, Ann I. "Libraries of Title VI Centers: Some Impressions and Some Questions." Washington, DC: Department of Education, 1982.

Signs of Trouble and Erosion: A Report on Graduate Education in America. A Report by the Graduate Education Subcommittee of the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance. John Brademas, Subcommittee Chairman. Washington, DC: The National Commission on Student Financial Assistance, 1983.

SRI International. "Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe." Prepared for the Association of American Universities and funded under U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command Contract No. DAMD17-83-C-3093. Arlington, VA: SRI International, 1983.

Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. James A. Perkins, Chairman. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Government Inter-Agency Language Roundtable. "Inter-Agency Language Roundtable Language Skill Level Definitions: Speaking." Arlington, VA: U.S. Government Inter-Agency Language Roundtable, 1983.

Weinberger, Caspar. National Convocation on Pre-College Education in Mathematics and Science, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC. Speech, 12 May 1982.

Wiley, David, and Dwyer, David, comps. "African Language Instruction in the United States: Directions and Priorities." East Lansing: African Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1980.